arXiv:1403.3462v1 [cs.DM] 13 Mar 2014

The Relativized Second Eigenvalue Conjecture of Alon

Joel Friedman

David-Emmanuel Kohler

Author address:

Department of Computer Science, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, CANADA, and Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2, CANADA.
E-mail address: jf@cs.ubc.ca or jf@math.ubc.ca

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2, CANADA.
E-mail address: david.emmanuel.kohler@gmail.com

Contents

List of Symbols ix

Chapter 0. Introduction 1
0.1. Our Main Results 3
0.2. Historical Context and Motivation 4
0.2.1. The Alon Second Eigenvalues Conjecture 4
0.2.2. The Relativized Alon Conjecture 6
0.2.3. The Hashimoto Matrix and Non-Regular Base Graphs 9

Chapter 1. Precise Terminology and Overview of the Proof 11
1.1. Precise Terminology 11
1.1.1. Graphs and Morphisms 11
1.1.2. Walks and Traces 12
1.1.3. Covering and Etale (Open Immersion) Maps 14
1.1.4. Variable-Length Graphs 17
1.1.5. The Broder-Shamir Model and Related Models 18
1.2. Remarks on the Trace Method 19
1.2.1. Broder and Shamir's Method: A Single Moment Estimate 19
1.2.2. Friedman's Asymptotic Expansions 20
1.2.3. Hashimoto Traces Give an Improvement 21
1.2.4. Tangles and the Limitations of the Trace Method 23
1.3. Asymptotic Expansions and The Loop 24
1.3.1. The Expected Number of Loops 24
1.3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3.3 25
1.3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.3.4 26
1.3.4. $1/n$-Asymptotic Expansions and B-Ramanujan Functions 27
1.3.5. Types and Finite Linear Combinations of $1/n$-Asymptotic Expansions 30
1.4. Certified Traces 31
1.4.1. The Certified Trace 31
1.4.2. Minimal Elements in Posets 32
1.5. Other New Ideas in This Article 33
1.5.1. A More General "side-stepping lemma" 33
1.5.2. The Second Idea: Weaker B-Ramanujan Functions, Simpler Estimates 35

Chapter 2. The d-Regular Case Without Half-Loops 37
2.1. Introduction and Overview of This Chapter 37
2.1.1. More on Types and Asymptotic Expansions 39
2.2. Preliminaries 41

2.2.1. The Order of a Graph and Pruned Graphs 41
2.2.2. Convolutions 43
2.2.3. Functions of Bounded Growth 45
2.2.4. Weighted Convolutions of B-Ramanujan Functions 47
2.2.5. Walk Statistics 50
2.3. Walk Sums 51
2.3.1. Potential Walks 52
2.3.2. Walk Sums 54
2.3.3. Asymptotic Expansion 56
2.3.4. Types and Forms 58
2.4. Tangles and the Certified Trace 63
2.4.1. Tangles 63
2.4.2. The Occurrence of Subgraphs 64
2.4.3. Finitely Certifiable Partial Orders 68
2.4.4. The Certified Trace 73
2.4.5. Asymptotic Expansions and a Proof of Theorem 2.1.2 74
2.5. Certified Traces In Graphs With Tangles and The Proof of Theorems 2.1.3 and 2.1.1 78
2.5.1. Potential Graph Specializations 79
2.5.2. Proof of Theorem 2.5.2. 85
2.5.3. The Proof of Theorem 2.5.1 86
2.5.4. Concluding the Proofs of Theorems 2.1.3 and 2.1.1 88
2.6. The Side-Stepping Lemma 88
2.6.1. The Shift Operator 89
2.6.2. Statement of the Side-Stepping Lemma 90
2.6.3. Proof of the First Exception Bound 93
2.6.4. The Proof of the Limit Formula 96
2.6.5. The End of The Proof of Lemma 2.6.7 101
2.7. Proof of the Relativized Alon Conjecture 102

Chapter 3. Generalizations and Further Directions 105
3.1. Irregular Graphs 105
3.2. Spreading in Random Covers of Regular Graphs 105
3.2.1. Spreaders 106
3.2.2. Preliminary Lemmas 107
3.2.3. Spreading in Random Graphs 108
3.2.4. Spreading in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for non-bipartite B 111
3.2.5. Spreading in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for bipartite B 116
3.3. The Fundamental Order and Ramanujan Bases 117
3.3.1. Computing The Fundamental Order 118
3.3.2. Lower Bound on the Fundamental Order of a d-Regular Graph 119
3.4. Algebraic Models 120
3.4.1. Theorems 0.1.1 and 0.1.3 for General Base Graphs 120
3.4.2. Some Examples of Algebraic Models 122
3.5. Mod-S Functions 123
3.5.1. Mod-S Polyexponentials 123
3.5.2. Strongly Ramanujan Graphs 125
3.6. Remarks for Future Directions 126
3.6.1. Weighted Hashimoto Matrices 126

3.6.2. Direct Adjacency Matrix Traces 126

Glossary 129

Bibliography 135

Abstract

We prove a relativization of the Alon Second Eigenvalue Conjecture for all d-regular base graphs, B, with $d \geq 3$: for any $\epsilon > 0$, we show that a random covering map of degree n to B has a new eigenvalue greater than $2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon$ in absolute value with probability $O(1/n)$. Furthermore, if B is a Ramanujan graph, we show that this probability is proportional to $n^{-\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)}$, where $\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)$ is an integer depending on B, which can be computed by a finite algorithm for any fixed B. For any d-regular graph, B, $\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)$ is greater than $\sqrt{d-1}$.

Our proof introduces a number of ideas that simplify and strengthen the methods of Friedman's proof of the original conjecture of Alon. The most significant new idea is that of a "certified trace," which is not only greatly simplifies our trace methods, but is the reason we can obtain the $n^{-\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)}$ estimate above. This estimate represents an improvement over Friedman's results of the original Alon conjecture for random d-regular graphs, for certain values of d.

Received by the editor March 14, 2014.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 68R10, 05C50; Secondary: 05C80, 15B52.
Key words and phrases. random, cover, eigenvalues, graph, relativized Alon conjecture, lifts, new eigenvalues.
Research supported in part by an NSERC grant.
Research supported in part by an NSERC grant.

List of Symbols

A_G	the adjacency matrix of a graph, G 3
$\lambda_i(G)$	i-th eigenvalue of A_G, in decreasing order 3
$\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)$	the new adjacency spectrum of G with respect to B 3
$\rho_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)$	new adjacency spectral radius 3
$\mathrm{Tr}(\,\cdot\,)$	the trace of a matrix 3
$\mathcal{C}_n(B)$	the Broder-Shamir model 3
$\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$	the fundamental power of B 4
$\chi(G)$	Euler characteristic of G 7
$\mathrm{Spec}(\,\cdot\,)$	the spectrum of a Hilbert space operator 7
$\rho(\,\cdot\,)$	the spectral radius of a Hilbert space operator 7
$\widehat{B}$	the universal cover of a graph, B 8
$W_{d/2}$	the bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops 8
H_d	the bouquet of d half-loops 8
H_G	Hashimoto matrix of the graph G 9
$\mu_1(G)$	the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of H_G 9
$\mu_i(G),\ i>1$	the other eigenvalues of H_G, in no particular order 9
$d_{\max}$	maximum degree of a graph 10
V_G	the vertex set of a graph or digraph G 12
E_G^{dir}	the edge set of a directed graph, or the directed edge set of a graph, G 12
E_G	the edge set of a graph, G 12
h_G	the head map $E_G^{\mathrm{dir}} \to V_G$ of a (di)graph, G 12
t_G	the tail map $E_G^{\mathrm{dir}} \to V_G$ of a (di)graph, G 12
ι_G	the edge involution $E_G^{\mathrm{dir}} \to E_G^{\mathrm{dir}}$ of a graph, G 12
D_G	the degree matrix of a graph, G 13
$\mathrm{Line}(G)$	directed line graph of G 13
$\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(H_G)$	new Hashimoto spectrum 16
$\rho_B^{\mathrm{new}}(H_G)$	new Hashimoto spectral radius 16
$\mathrm{VLG}(G,\vec{k})$	realization of a variable-length graph 17
$\mathrm{ord}\,\psi$	the order of a graph, $-\chi(\psi)$ 23
$\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$	the square root of $\rho(H_B)$ 23
Occurs_B	connected graphs that can occur in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ 23
Tangle_B	the set of B-tangles 23
$\mathrm{Tangle}_{<r,B}$	the set of B-tangles of order $< r$ 23
$\mathrm{Tangle}_{B,\epsilon}$	the set of (B,ϵ)-tangles 23
$\mathrm{Tangle}_{<r,B,\epsilon}$	the set of (B,ϵ)-tangles of order less than r 23
$\mathrm{Graph}(w)$	the graph of a walk, w 25
$\rho^k(H_B)$	shorthand for $(\rho(H_B))^k$ 29
$\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)$	r-th certified trace of length k 31

$\mathrm{TypeGraph}(w)$	the underlying graph of the type associated to w	31
$\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$	the set of graphs with a B-tangle of order less than r	33
$\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}}$	the indicator function of $\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$	33
$\mathrm{TF}_{r,B}$	the set of graph free of B-tangles of order less than r	33
$\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}_{r,B}}$	the indicator function of $\mathrm{TF}_{r,B}$	33
$g_1 * g_2$	the convolution of g_1 and g_2	43
$(w;\vec{t})$	a potential walk	52
$\mathrm{Graph}(w;\vec{t})$	the graph traced out by a potential walk	52
$\mathrm{ord}(w;\vec{t})$	the order of a potential walk	53
$[\vec{t}]_{n,w}$	the (n,w)-equivalence symmetry class of $\vec{t}$	53
$[w;\vec{t}]_n$	equivalence class of potential walks	53
$\mathcal{W}$	a walk collection	54
$\mathcal{W}(k,n)$	(k,n)-walks in $\mathcal{W}$	54
$\mathcal{W}_n(G,k)$	(k,n)-modified trace of $\mathcal{W}$	54
$\mathrm{WalkSum}(\mathcal{W},k,n)$	(k,n) walk sum of $\mathcal{W}$	54
SNBC	strictly non-backtracking closed walks collection	54
$\mathcal{T}$	a type	58
$\mathcal{F}$	a form	59
$\mathcal{T}(w;\vec{t})$	type of the potential walk $(w;\vec{t})$	59
$\mathcal{F}(w;\vec{t})$	form of the potential walk $(w;\vec{t})$	59
$\mathrm{Types}[r]$	types of order less than r	59
$\mathrm{NB}(e_1,e_2,k)$	# of non-backtracking k-walks from e_1 to e_2	60
$W_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{W},k,\vec{m})$	consistent walks in $\mathcal{F}$ of multiplicity $\vec{m}$	60
$W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m},\vec{k}(\mathcal{F}))$	consistent $(\vec{m},\vec{k})$-walks in $\mathcal{T}$	60
$\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}^{\min}$	set of minimal tangles in $\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}$	63
CertSNBC	certified SNBC walk collection	73
CertTr	certified trace	73
$\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}$	truncated certified trace	73

CHAPTER 0

Introduction

The main goal of this article is to study spectral properties of a random covering map of large degree of a fixed graph, B. The main result is to prove a relativization of Alon Second Eigenvalue Conjecture, formulated in [**Fri03**], for any *base graph*, B, that is regular.

Recall that Alon's Second Eigenvalue Conjecture says that for fixed integer $d \geq 3$, and a real $\epsilon > 0$, a random d-regular graph on n vertices has second adjacency eigenvalue at most $2(d-1)^{1/2} + \epsilon$ with *high probability*, i.e., probability than tends to one as n tends to infinity. The interest in this conjecture is that the conclusion implies that most graphs have, in a sense, almost optimal spectral properties, which in turn implies a number of "expansion" or "well connectedness" properties of the graph. The conjecture was established with weaker bounds in [**BS87, FKS89, Fri91**], and finally settled affirmatively in [**Fri08**]. All these papers bound not only the second eigenvalue with high probability, but also—with the same bound—the absolute value of all subdominant adjacency eigenvalues, i.e., all eigenvalues—including the negative ones—excepting the dominant (largest) eigenvalue, namely d.

One generalization of the above spectral bounds is the notion of a relative expander, discussed some two decades ago in [**Fri93a**]; roughly speaking, for any covering map, we consider its *new adjacency eigenvalues*, i.e., the eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix of the source not arising from eigenfunctions pulled back from the target. A random covering map of degree n to a d-regular graph with one vertex is just a random d-regular graph with n vertices; the subdominant eigenvalues are precisely the new eigenvalues.

The relativized Alon conjecture, regarding random covering maps, was formulated in [**Fri03**], and probably received more attention[1] due to the independent work of Amit and Linial [**AL02**], and related work [**AL06, ALM02, ALMR01**], which gave prominence to studies of random covering maps and, implicitly, their relative properties. Aside from [**Fri03**], the relativized Alon conjecture stated there was proven with weaker new spectral bounds in [**LP10, LSV11, ABG10, Pud12**]. Friedman introduced relative expansion [**Fri93a**] without specific applications, rather in anticipated applications, as this relative notion seemed an intrinsically interesting generalization of expansion; concretely, one can make the simple observation that a covering map of a good expander with good relative expansion implies that covering graph is, itself, another good expander. However, some two decades later, relative expansion has recently seen a dramatic application to graph theory,

[1]Indeed, the article [**Fri93a**] was circulated in a limited fashion, but was rejected for publication. By the time of the submission of [**Fri03**], Amit and Linial's work [**AL02**], as well as related works [**AL06, ALM02, ALMR01**], had given relative properties of random covering maps more prominence.

in the construction of by Marcus, Spielman, and Srivastava [**MSS13**], inspired by [**BL06**] (building on [**FM**]), which proves the existence of d-regular bipartite *Ramanujan* graphs for all fixed positive integers d, for an infinite set of numbers of vertices; here the term "Ramanujan" means that all eigenvalues, excepting d and, for bipartite graphs, $-d$, are of absolute value at most $2(d-1)^{1/2}$. The existence proof in [**MSS13**] uses degree two covers of bipartite graphs requiring the base graph to be Ramanujan.

We remark that Bilu and Linial [**BL06**] have pointed out that for certain regular base graphs (which "almost" decompose into many disconnected, small graphs), most degree two covers will be very poor relative expanders. Our main theorem, by contrast, shows that for any fixed regular base graph, covers of large degree are, with high probability, nearly relatively Ramanujan.

Our approach to the relativized Alon conjecture follows the Broder-Shamir trace method of [**BS87**], with its refinements of [**Fri91, Fri08**], which we adapt to the more general situation of random, degree n covering maps of a fixed graph, B. However, our proofs significantly simplify the arguments of [**Fri08**]; in particular, we replace the cumbersome *selective trace* of [**Fri08**] by the much simpler *certified trace* of this article; there are several other new ideas that simplify and strengthen the methods of [**Fri08**].

We mention that it is not surprising that one can generalize the results of [**Fri08**] to obtain the relativized Alon conjecture in some very special cases. For example, if the base graph has two vertices and is d-regular, then the eigenvalues of its Hashimoto matrix lie in the set $\{d-1, 1-d, 1, -1\}$, and it seems likely that the methods of [**Fri08**] will generalize in a fairly straightforward way (however, this article gives the first proof of this result). But it is not at all clear that the methods of [**Fri08**] carry over to general d-regular base graphs, especially when B is not, say, Ramanujan. Indeed, some of the previous work, such as [**LSV11**], give estimates that degrade when B has eigenvalues close to—but less than—d. And, indeed, this article develops some new techniques that are needed *precisely when B is not Ramanujan*. Furthermore, in this article we obtain much sharper probability estimates when (and—at present—only when) B is Ramanujan.

This article is organized as follows. This chapter will state our main results and the historical context of this conjecture; we will draw upon terminology only to be made precise in Chapter 1. In Chapter 1 we shall state some precise terminology, and give an overview of the trace methods and our proof of the relativized Alon conjecture for regular graphs. Chapter 2 of this article will prove the relativized Alon conjecture in the case where B is regular and without *half-loops* (half-loops in the sense of, say, [**Fri93b**]). Chapter 3 will prove the relativized Alon conjecture for all regular base graphs, in a number of different models; it will make some further remarks, including refinements of the probability estimates when the base graph is Ramanujan, and aspects of the relativized Alon conjecture for non-regular graphs.

At present we have only weaker versions of the relativized Alon Conjecture when the base graph is not regular, and our results are only interesting for certain non-regular base graphs.

Let us review the relativized Alon conjecture and its historical context. For brevity, at time we shall assume some terminology of algebraic graph theory to be given in Chapter 1.

0.1. Our Main Results

In this section we will state the main result of this paper, using some fairly common—although not entirely standard—terminology to be made precise later. For example, in this paper a *graph* may have multiple edges and two types of self-loops: whole-loops and half-loops, in the sense of [**Fri93b**]; however, in much of the graph theory literature, it is more standard to insist that a graph have no multiple edges and/or that all self-loops be whole-loops.

The eigenvalues of the adjacency matrix, A_G, of a finite undirected graph, G, are real; we order these eigenvalues and denote them as

$$\lambda_1(G) \geq \lambda_2(G) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n(G), \tag{0.1}$$

where n is the number of vertices in G. If G is d-regular, i.e., each vertex is of degree d, then $\lambda_1 = d$.

For any covering map, sometimes called a *lift of graphs*[2], $\pi\colon G \to B$, the multiset of eigenvalues of A_G can be partitioned into two sets: *old eigenvalues*[3], arising via pullback from B adjacency eigenvectors, and the remaining *new eigenvalues*, of eigenfunctions whose values sum to zero on any vertex fibre of π. We let $\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)$ be the multiset of new eigenvalues of G, and we let $\rho_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)$ be the largest absolute value occurring in the finite set of real numbers $\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)$. We remark that for any positive integer, k, we have

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)} \lambda^k = \mathrm{Tr}(A_G^k) - \mathrm{Tr}(A_B^k), \tag{0.2}$$

where $\mathrm{Tr}(\,\cdot\,)$ denotes the trace. It follows that the $\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)$ depends only on B and G, not on the particular covering map $\pi\colon G \to B$.

For every graph, B, and positive integer, n, we will define a probability space, the *Broder-Shamir model*, $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, whose atoms are random covering maps, $\pi\colon G \to B$, of degree n of B; this model closely resembles the model of random regular graphs used by Broder and Shamir in [**BS87**]. If B has no half-loops, and E_B denotes the set of edges of B, then $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is formed via $|E_B|$ independently and uniformly chosen permutations of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ in the natural way. In fact, our main theorem will apply to a number of variants of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$.

Our first main result concerns arbitrary regular base graphs.

THEOREM 0.1.1. *Let B be a d-regular graph with $d \geq 3$. Then for any real $\epsilon > 0$, there is a constant, $C = C_{B,\epsilon} > 0$ for which*

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\, \rho_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G) \geq 2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon \,\Big] \leq C_{B,\epsilon} n^{-1}. \tag{0.3}$$

Our second main result concerns regular *Ramanujan graphs*.

DEFINITION 0.1.2. We say that a d-regular graph, B, is a *Ramanujan graph* if any eigenvalue of A_B other than d and the possible eigenvalue $-d$ has absolute value at most $2\sqrt{d-1}$.

---

[2]After [**AL02**], Amit, Linial, and their collaborators began using the term *lift* to avoid confusion, since the word *covering* has strong connotations in combinatorial optimization[**ALMR01, AL06, ALM02, LR05**].

[3]The old/new eigenvalues is terminology borrowed by Friedman [**Fri93a, Fri03**] from the theory of automorphic forms.

THEOREM 0.1.3. *Let B be a d-regular Ramanujan graph with $d \geq 3$. There is a finite algorithm to determine an integer $\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)$, and a real number $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon_0(B) > 0$ for which*

(1) there is a constant, $C_1 = C_1(B)$, for which

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \Big[\rho_B^{\text{new}}(A_G) \geq 2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon_0 \Big] \geq C_1(B) n^{-\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)}, \tag{0.4}$$

and

(2) for any ϵ with $0 < \epsilon < \epsilon_0(B)$ there is a constant $C_2 = C_2(B, \epsilon)$ for which

$$\text{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \Big[\rho_B^{\text{new}}(A_G) \geq 2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon \Big] \leq C_2(B, \epsilon) n^{-\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)}. \tag{0.5}$$

As we shall explain below, that this theorem gives an improvement to the results of [**Fri08**] for certain values of d.

The above two theorems, like the results of [**LSV11**], gives sharper theorems when the base graph is Ramanujan. We shall state and prove our sharper results, for Ramanujan base graphs, in Section 3.3. In this same section we will see, essentially from Lemma 6.7 of [**Fri08**], that for any d-regular graph, B, we have

$$\eta_{\text{fund}}(B) > \sqrt{d-1}.$$

It follows that Theorem 0.1.3 gets tighter bounds on the probability in the Relativized Alon Conjecture as d increases.

0.2. Historical Context and Motivation

In this section we elaborate on the historical context and motivation of our main theorems given earlier, at the beginning of this chapter.

0.2.1. The Alon Second Eigenvalues Conjecture. The theoretical computer science and network theory literature in the 1970's and 1980's gave rise to expanders and many related graphs, such as *concentrators* and *superconcentrators*; see [**HLW06, KS11**] and the references given there for this (rather long) story.

It is known that G has numerous desirable properties, often called *expansion properties*—such as large "isoperimetric" constants, desirable in communication networks—provided that its subdominant adjacency eigenvalues are small, meaning that $\lambda_2(G)$, and sometimes $\lambda_n(G)$, are sufficiently close to zero; see, for example, [**HLW06, KS11**]. Historically, this spectral approach to desirable graph properties via adjacency eigenvalues appears explicitly in the work of Alon and Milman [**AM84, AM85**] and Tanner [**Tan84**]; however, these ideas appear earlier, in Gabber and Galil [**GG81**], and perhaps other articles, implicitly in the proofs of its main theorems. This lead Noga Alon [**Alo86**] to study spectral properties of regular graphs; there he formulated what we call the *Alon Second Eigenvalue Conjecture*, the conjecture that for any $d \geq 3$ and $\epsilon > 0$, as $n \to \infty$ we have that a random d-regular graph on n vertices, G, has

$$\lambda_2(G) \leq 2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon \tag{0.6}$$

with probability tending to one as n tends to infinity. Alon and Boppana showed that the constant $2\sqrt{d-1}$ cannot be improved upon (see [**Alo86, Nil91**], with improvements of Friedman and Kahale [**Fri93b**]). A number of papers demonstrated a variant of the above conjecture, with $2\sqrt{d-1}$ replaced with a larger function of d, [**BS87, FKS89, Fri91**]; the conjecture was finally settled in [**Fri08**].

Before reviewing the main result of [**Fri08**], we remark that Alon's conjecture, at least in principle, depends on what model of random d-regular graph on n vertices one takes. The paper of [**BS87**] insists that d is even, and forms a random d-regular graph on n vertices by independently choosing $d/2$ permutations on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ uniformly; each permutation gives rise to a 2-regular graph on n vertices in the natural way, and the $d/2$ permutations hence give rise to a d-regular graph (therefore possibly with multiple edges and/or self-loops). This model is called $\mathcal{G}_{n,d}$ in [**Fri08**], and is used in [**FKS89, Fri91**] as well as [**BS87, Fri08**].

Broder and Shamir [**BS87**] gave estimates on the expected value of the traces of adjacency matrix powers; their estimates easily imply[4] a weaker version of the Alon conjecture, where the $2(d-1)^{1/2}$ in (0.6) is replaced by[5]

$$d^{1/2} 2^{1/2} (d-1)^{1/4}. \tag{0.7}$$

Kahn and Szemeredi [**FKS89**] gave a modified counting argument to improve this expression to

$$C d^{1/2},$$

with a constant C that was not estimated, while independently Friedman [**FKS89, Fri91**] improved the trace methods of Broder-Shamir to obtain

$$d^{1/(r+1)} \Big(2(d-1)^{1/2} \Big)^{r/(r+1)}$$

for r of size roughly $d^{1/2}/2$ (see (1.6) for the precise value), which for large d is roughly

$$2(d-1)^{1/2} + 2\log_e(d) + O(1).$$

The Alon conjecture was finally settled in [**Fri08**].

In [**Fri08**], other models of random graphs are described, including models of d-regular graphs on n vertices where d and n can be of arbitrary parity; however, all these models have a certain "algebraic" property (see Subsection 1.1.5 and Section 3.4 of this article or [**Fri08**]). There are many models of random regular graphs to which the results in [**Fri08**] do not directly apply; however, by the time of [**Fri08**]—but not at the time of [**BS87**]—there were enough *contiguity* theorems, which imply that for all the usual models of regular graphs, Alon's conjecture in any model is equivalent to Alon's conjecture in the other models; for a discussion of contiguity theorems see Section 3.4 and [**Fri08**] and the references there. Unfortunately, contiguity results are not currently available for random covering maps of a fixed base graph, and hence our main results are only known to be valid in the "algebraic" type of models that we describe in this article.

The main theorem of [**Fri08**] is the theorem below, although it is valid only for "algebraic" models, such as $\mathcal{G}_{n,d}$ described above, or such as the models $\mathcal{H}_{n,d}, \mathcal{I}_{n,d}, \mathcal{J}_{n,d}$ of [**Fri08**]; furthermore, the $\eta = \eta(d)$ in the theorem below depends on the model (it is roughly twice as large for $\mathcal{H}_{n,d}$, which is the model where we insist that each of the $d/2$ permutations forming the random graph are, in their cyclic representations, each a single cycle of length n).

---

[4]This was not noticed by Broder and Shamir in [**BS87**], although this was explained in [**FKS89, Fri91**].

[5]The constant in [**BS87**] is $2d^{3/4}$, although Friedman explained in [**FKS89, Fri91**], a simple modification of their methods to obtain the slightly stronger constant of (0.7)

THEOREM 0.2.1 (Friedman, [**Fri08**]). *Let $d \geq 3$ be a fixed integer. Then there exists a positive integer, $\eta = \eta(d)$, such that for any sufficiently small positive real number ϵ there are positive C_1, C_2 for which the following holds: the probability that a random d-regular graph, G, on n vertices has $|\lambda_i(G)| \geq 2(d-1)^{1/2} + \epsilon$ for at least one $i \leq 2$ is between $C_1 n^{-\eta-1}$ and $C_2 n^{-\eta}$.*

We note that for "most" values of d, namely d for which $d-1$ is not a odd perfect square, the lower bound of $C_1 n^{-\eta-1}$ was improved to $C_1 n^{-\eta}$ in [**Fri08**]. For the "exceptional" values of d, where $d-1$ is not an odd perfect square, our Theorem 0.1.3 represents an improvement of the lower bound of [**Fri08**] by a factor proportional to n, giving upper and lower bounds that match to within a constant factor (although this constant factor may depend, at least in our theorems, on $\epsilon > 0$). We also note that the contiguity theorems mentioned earlier speak only of probabilities that tend to zero as n tends to infinity, and do not address, at least in their literal definition, the exponent, $\eta = \eta(d)$, of n in the probability estimates of Theorems 0.2.1 and Theorem 0.1.3 above. For example, for fixed even d and varying even n, it is known that the spaces $\mathcal{G}_{n,d}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{n,d}$ of [**Fri08**] are contiguous, but the $\eta(d)$ is larger for $\mathcal{I}_{n,d}$, roughly for the reason that $\mathcal{I}_{n,d}$ does not allow self-loops.

One reason that expanders continue to receive attention is that they are simple to define and related to a number of other fields, such as random matrices (see, for example, [**TV12**] for a survey) and the type of deviations from the principal term that one studies in the theory of automorphic forms and number theory in general. For example, the theory of Ihara Zeta functions gives connections between p-adic groups and graphs (see, for example, [**ST96, ST00, TS07**]). Furthermore, the field of expanders has seen steady progress over the years, with many interesting questions still unsolved.

Two different methods have been used to study Alon's above conjecture:

(1) trace methods—akin to those pioneered by Wigner [**Wig55**] to study random matrices (see [**TV12**] for a survey of this large field)—but that require a significant adaptation to give interesting results for random d-regular graphs, as first done by Broder and Shamir [**BS87**], and
(2) counting methods, as used by Kahn-Szemeredi [**FKS89**], similarly requiring a significant adaptation from the standard counting methods to give interesting results for d-regular graphs.

We mention that there are other generalizations of the Alon second eigenvalue conjecture to situations with random graphs other than those we study here. Other interesting classes of random graphs include those of [**FJR$^+$98**] (see also the non-random construction of Kassabov [**Kas07**]). Another related question on spectral properties of random graphs arises when the adjacency matrix is replaced with an arbitrary element of the group algebra of the fundamental group of the graph, mentioned to us by Lewis Bowen.

0.2.2. The Relativized Alon Conjecture. In the early 1990's, Friedman began to investigate a number of ideas and general principles of Grothendieck as applied to graph theory, specifically the topics of expander graphs and Boolean functions which arise in theoretical computer science. (see [**Fri93b, Fri93a**], and later [**Fri03, Fri05, Fri06, Fri07, Fri11b, Fri11a, Fri**]). One compelling idea emerging from Grothendieck's work is the importance of *relativization*, which gives rise to the relativized Alon conjecture of [**Fri03**] that is the focus of this paper.

Roughly speaking, to *relativize* a theorem means to take a theorem about objects in a category and prove an analogous result about morphisms; usually, one also requires the theorem about morphisms to implies the theorem about objects. Consider, for example, the following two toy theorems.

THEOREM 0.2.2. *A graph, G, that appears in the Broder-Shamir model of a random d-regular graph on n vertices has Euler characteristic $\chi(G) = n(2-d)/2$.*

THEOREM 0.2.3. *If $\pi\colon G \to B$ is a n-to-1 covering map, then $\chi(G) = n\,\chi(B)$.*

If B is d-regular and has one vertex, then its Euler characteristic is $(2-d)/2$. Hence, the first theorem regarding G, a theorem about objects, is implied by the second theorem about morphisms. Furthermore, consider the category, $\mathrm{Cov}(B)$, whose objects are graphs with a covering map to B, whose morphisms are graph morphisms preserving the B maps. Then B is a terminal object of $\mathrm{Cov}(B)$. So, more precisely, the second theorem reduces to the first when B is the terminal object of $\mathrm{Cov}(B)$.

Friedman's motivation to study relativization (discussed in detail in [**Fri93a**], some aspects of which, such as torsors, appear in [**Fri93b**]) was based on the anticipation that applying Grothendieck's ideas to graph theory may yield new interesting research and applications; furthermore, clearly a covering map to a base graph that is a good expander yields a new good expander in the covering graph iff the covering map has good relative expansion. Also, Noga Alon suggested (see [**Fri93a**], end of Subsection 1) that relativization could be used to construct new expanders by forming a quotient of a relative expander; we remark that Alon's idea represents a natural idea to improve the recent work of [**MSS13**], from their bipartite Ramanujan graphs to possibly obtaining new, non-bipartite Ramanujan graphs. Despite some limited circulation of [**Fri93a**], the article was rejected for publication[6], in part because the article contained no new interesting families of new graphs at the time, twenty years before the remarkable recent paper of Marcus, Speilman, and Srivastava [**MSS13**]. This line of research become more active some ten years later, with the independent effort begun by Amit and Linial to study random graph covers [**AL02**], and later [**AL06, ALM02, ALMR01, LR05**] (where the term "lift" replaces "covering map"), and the article [**Fri03**], where the relativized Alon conjecture is stated, and the Broder-Shamir technique is adapted to prove results analogous to those of [**BS87**] for random graph covers. The long standing problem of showing the existence of families of d-regular Ramanujan graphs (i.e., sequences of d-regular Ramanujan graphs on an arbitrarily large number of vertices) for all integral values of d was recently solved by Marcus, Speilman, and Srivastava [**MSS13**], via towers of relatively Ramanujan degree two covers of any bipartite Ramanujan graph, inspired by the work of Bilu and Linial [**BL06**], in turn inspired by [**FM**].

The following conjecture is stated in [**Fri03**], which we give after the following definition.

DEFINITION 0.2.4. If A is an operator on a Hilbert space, we let $\mathrm{Spec}(A)$ be the spectrum of A, and $\rho(A)$ be the spectral radius of A. If A is a matrix with real

[6]It was rejected from the *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, submitted May 14, 1993, and no further formal publication was pursued. The paper was re-LaTeXed and posted on the author's website (along with numerous other papers) around 1995, but does not appear to have been modified since the May 1993 submission.

entries, indexed on a set, S, where S is either finite or infinite, we view A as acting on the real Hilbert space $L^2(S)$ with its standard inner product,

$$(f, g) = \sum_s f(s)g(s).$$

Hence $\rho(A)$ denotes the spectral radius of A acting on $L^2(S)$ as above. In the above, we may allow A to have complex values by working over the complex Hilbert space $L^2(S)$, where the complex inner product sums over $\overline{f(s)}g(s)$ instead of $f(s)g(s)$.

CONJECTURE 0.2.5 (The relativized Alon conjecture). *For any fixed graph, B, let $\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})$ be the spectral radius of the adjacency operator on the universal cover, $\widehat{B}$, of B. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)} \big[\, \rho_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G) \geq \rho(A_{\widehat{B}}) + \epsilon \,\big]$$

tends to zero as $n \to \infty$.

This conjecture reduces to the original Alon Second Eigenvalue Conjecture in the case where d is even and $B = W_{d/2}$ is the bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops, or where d is arbitrary and $B = H_d$ is the bouquet of d half-loops. Since the identity map of B represents a terminal element in the category of graphs with a covering map to B, the above conjecture is truly a *relativization* of Alon's conjecture for the case studied in by Broder and Shamir, [**BS87**], which amounts to graphs with a covering map to $W_{d/2}$, or, equivalently, graphs formed by $d/2$ permutations (where we order the permutations or, equivalently, label each of the $d/2$ permutations with different label chosen from $\{1, 2, \ldots, d/2\}$).

Versions of Theorem 0.1.1 were proven with $\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})$ replaced with larger constants. Specifically, [**Fri03**] gave a short adaptation of the methods of Broder and Shamir, proving Theorem 0.1.1, for arbitrary B, with $\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})$ replaced with

$$\lambda_1(B)^{1/2}\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})^{1/2}, \tag{0.8}$$

where, as in (0.1), $\lambda_1(B)$ denotes the largest eigenvalue of the adjacency matrix of B. Linial and Puder [**LP10**] improved this, again for arbitrary B, to

$$3\lambda_1(B)^{1/3}\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})^{2/3},$$

again using the Broder-Shamir technique but calculating one extra term of the associated power series (as in [**Fri91, Fri08**]). By adapting the Kahn-Szemeredi counting technique to the relative case, for B d-regular, Lubetzky, Sudakov, and Vu, [**LSV11**], obtained the bound

$$C(\log d)\big(\max(d^{1/2}, \lambda_2(B), |\lambda_n(B)|)\big),$$

with a constant C that was not estimated. Addario-Berry and Griffiths [**ABG10**] improved this to

$$Cd^{1/2},$$

again, for d-regular B, and estimated their C to be at most 430656. Recently Puder [**Pud12**], building on [**Pud11, PP12**], used trace methods to get the impressive bound

$$2\sqrt{d-1} + 0.835$$

in the d-regular case (see the paragraph after equation (6.1) in [**Pud12**]), and the bound

$$\sqrt{3}\,\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})$$

for arbitrary B. Note that results above are successive improvements, at least for d-regular B, with d sufficiently large.

It is also interesting to note that the trace method bounds of [**BS87, Fri91, Fri03, LP10**], and probably [**Pud12**] as well, can be slightly improved by using the expected *Hashimoto matrix* traces. We shall explain this in Subsection 1.2.3.

As mentioned before, in Theorem 0.1.1 we establish the relativized Alon conjecture for any d-regular base graph, B, in which case it is well-known that

$$\rho(A_{\widehat{B}}) = 2(d-1)^{1/2}.$$

0.2.3. The Hashimoto Matrix and Non-Regular Base Graphs. At present we are unable to prove Conjecture 0.2.5 for arbitrary B; we can, for certain non-regular B, prove a weakened form of Conjecture 0.2.5, with $\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})$ replaced by a larger value. We shall explain what we can prove; in brief, the problem is that our techniques more directly address the expected trace of powers of the Hashimoto matrix rather than the adjacency matrix.

We shall prove Theorem 0.1.1 by using the fundamental ideas of Broder-Shamir ([**BS87**]), later refined by Friedman ([**Fri91, Fri08**]). These methods enable one to estimate the expected number of closed, non-backtracking walks in a random matrix, G, of a given length, possibly subject to certain additional constraints (such as being strictly non-backtracking). This leads us to theorems regarding the eigenvalues of the *Hashimoto matrix*, H_G, of a random graph, G. For d-regular graphs, there is a direct translation between Hashimoto eigenvalues and adjacency eigenvalues, and this can be used to prove Theorem 0.1.1; this direct translation is essentially used by [**BS87, Fri91, Fri08**], where results on the expected number of non-backtracking walks of certain types are used to infer bounds on the traces of powers of A_G with G a random d-regular graph on n vertices.

The *Hashimoto matrix*, H_G, of a graph, G is the adjacency matrix of the *directed line graph* or *oriented line graph* of G. We will give precise definitions in Section 1.1; roughly speaking, the oriented line graph of G is the graph whose vertices are the directed edges of G (i.e., the number of half-loops plus twice the number of other undirected edges of G), and whose edges consist of non-backtracking walks of length two in G. Throughout this paper, we shall use $\mu_1(G)$ to denote the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of H_G (i.e., its largest positive eigenvalue), and use $\mu_i(G)$ for $i = 2, \ldots, m$ to denote the other eigenvalues of H_G, in no particular order (the order will not matter); here m is the number of directed edges of G, which is twice the number of undirected edges plus the number of half-loops of G. The "Ihara determinantal formula" states that for a connected graph, G, without half-loops, we have

$$\det(\mu I - H_G) = \det\big(\mu^2 I - \mu A_G + (D_G - I)\big)(\mu^2 - 1)^{-\chi(G)} \tag{0.9}$$

where A_G is the adjacency matrix of G and D_G is the diagonal "vertex degree counting" matrix of G (i.e., D_G is the degree of v at the (v, v) entry, and zero otherwise), and where I denotes the appropriate identity matrix (the $m \times m$ identity on the left-hand-side, with m as above, and the $n \times n$ on the right-hand-side, where n is the number of vertices of G); this was established by Ihara [**Iha66**] for regular graphs, G, and in general by Bass [**Bas92**], Hashimoto [**Has89, Has90, Has92**], and others (see [**Ter11**]). The above left- or right-hand-side is the reciprocal *Ihara Zeta function* of the graph (see, for example, [**ST96, ST00, TS07, Ter11**]). Consequently, if G is d-regular, the Hashimoto eigenvalues, $\mu_i(G)$, of G are given as the

two roots, μ, of

$$\mu^2 - \mu\lambda_j + (d-1) = 0,$$

for each adjacency matrix eigenvalue, λ_j, plus an additional $-\chi(G)$ multiplicity of the 1 and -1 eigenvalues (the values ± 1 can also occur in the above quadratic equation, namely for $\lambda_j = \pm d$). If G has half-loops, then a similar formula holds with minor modification of the ± 1 eigenvalues (see [**Fri08**], for example). It follows that for d-regular graphs, G, knowledge of all the adjacency eigenvalues, λ_j, is, in a sense, equivalent to knowledge of all the Hashimoto eigenvalues, μ_i.

We shall explain that the method of Broder-Shamir [**BS87**] makes essential use of the fact that we consider only non-backtracking walks. It therefore turns out that all methods determine information on the Hashimoto eigenvalues, $\mu_i(G)$, of random covering graphs, G, rather that on the adjacency eigenvalues, $\lambda_j(G)$. In particular, if B is non-regular, then our theorems may give better information on Hashimoto eigenvalues of a random $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ than adjacency eigenvalues. When A_G and D_G in (0.9) commute, i.e., when G is d-regular, then A_G and D_G have a common eigenbasis, and this gives a rather direct translation between spectral information of A_G and D_G to spectral information of H_G. But in the general case, such a translation is not, at present, available (see especially, [**AFH**]).

As an example, our trace methods prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 0.2.6. *Let B be an arbitrary connected graph of negative Euler characteristic. Let τ_0 be any positive real number such that (1) $\tau_0^2 \geq \rho(H_B)$, and (2) for every covering map $\pi\colon G \to B$ in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, we have that any non-real eigenvalues of the Hashimoto matrix, H_G, of G, are of absolute value at most τ_0. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there is a constant $C = C_\epsilon$ for which*

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, \rho_B^{\mathrm{new}}(H_G) \geq \tau_0 + \epsilon\,] \leq C_\epsilon n^{-1}$$

for all n.

We mention that we may be able to somewhat relax the condition on the non-real eigenvalues of G by proving a stronger "side-stepping lemma," Lemma 2.6.7 (a weaker version of which appears in [**Fri08**]).

In Section 3.1 we use a result of Kotani and Sunada, in [**KS00**], to obtain the following consequence of Theorem 0.2.6.

THEOREM 0.2.7. *For any graph, B, Conjecture 0.2.5 holds with $\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})$ replaced with $2(d_{\max} - 1)^{1/2}$, where $d_{\max} = d_{\max}(B)$ is the maximum degree of a vertex in B*

For certain B the above theorem gives a very good result. For example, if each vertex of B has degree either $d_{\max}$ or $d_{\max} - 1$, and $d_{\max}$ is very large, then $\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})$ is at least $2(d_{\min} - 1)^{1/2}$, where $d_{\min} = d_{\min}(B)$ is the minimum degree of B. Hence the above theorem gives an improvement of Puder's result [**Pud12**] in this case, which is the best result to date.

On the other hand, for certain B the above theorem does not give any non-trivial result. For example, if B, consists entirely of two long cycles that meet in a single vertex, then $d_{\max} = 4$, while $\rho(A_B)$ can be arbitrarily close to one, as the two cycles' lengths goes to infinity. Since $\rho(A_B)$ is an upper bound on $\rho(A_{\widehat{B}})$ and on $\rho(A_G)$ for any G admitting a covering map to B, the above theorem, for certain B, gives an interesting result, weaker than the trivial bound on $\rho(A_G)$.

CHAPTER 1

Precise Terminology and Overview of the Proof

In this chapter we will make all our terminology precise, and give an overview of Chapter 2, which gives a proof of the Relativized Alon Conjecture in the case of d-regular base graphs without half-loops. We shall at times refer to arbitrary base graphs, but usually we shall do so just to illustrate certain ideas, such as what we mean by an "algebraic model" (see the end of Section 1.1).

1.1. Precise Terminology

In this subsection we give specify our precise definitions for a number of concepts in algebraic graph theory. We note that such definitions vary a bit in the literature. For example, in this paper graphs may have multiple edges and two types of self-loops—half-loops and whole-loops—in the terminology of [**Fri93b**], and similar to many other mathematical formulations of graph theory, such as in the work of Stark and Terras on Zeta functions of graphs [**ST96, ST00, TS07**].

1.1.1. Graphs and Morphisms.

Definition 1.1.1. A *directed graph* (or *digraph*) is a tuple $G = (V, E^{\text{dir}}, t, h)$ where V and E^{dir} are sets—the vertex and directed edge sets—and $t\colon E^{\text{dir}} \to V$ is the *tail map* and $h\colon E^{\text{dir}} \to V$ is the *head map*. A directed edge e is called *self-loop* if $t(e) = h(e)$, that is, if its tail is its head. Note that our definition also allows for *multiple edges*, that is directed edges with identical tails and heads. Unless specifically mentioned, we will only consider directed graphs which have finitely many vertices and directed edges.

A graph, roughly speaking, is a directed graph with an involution that pairs the edges.

Definition 1.1.2. An *undirected graph* (or simply a *graph*) is a tuple $G = (V, E^{\text{dir}}, t, h, \iota)$ where $(V, E^{\text{dir}}, t, h)$ is a directed graph and where $\iota\colon E^{\text{dir}} \to E^{\text{dir}}$, called the *opposite map* or *involution* of the graph, is an involution on the set of directed edges (that is, $\iota^2 = \text{id}_{E^{\text{dir}}}$ is the identity) satisfying $t\iota = h$. The directed graph $G = (V, E^{\text{dir}}, t, h)$ is called the *underlying directed graph* of the graph G. If e is an edge, we denote by $e^{-1} = \iota(e)$ and call it the *opposite edge*. A self-loop e is called a *half-loop* if $\iota(e) = e$, and otherwise is called a *whole-loop*.

The opposite map induces an equivalence relation on the directed edges of the graph, with $e \in E^{\text{dir}}$ equivalent to ιe; we call the quotient set, E, the *undirected edges* of the graph G (or simply its *edges*). Given an edge of a graph, an *orientation* of that edge is the choice of a representative directed edge in the equivalence relation (given by the opposite map).

NOTATION 1.1.3. For a graph, G, we use the notation $V_G, E_G, E_G^{\mathrm{dir}}, t_G, h_G, \iota_G$ to denote the vertex set, edge set, directed edge set, tail map, head map, and opposite map of G; similarly for directed graphs, G.

DEFINITION 1.1.4. A *morphism of directed graphs*, $\varphi\colon G \to H$ is a pair $\varphi = (\varphi_V, \varphi_E)$ for which $\varphi_V\colon V_G \to V_H$ is a map of vertices and $\varphi_E\colon E_G^{\mathrm{dir}} \to E_H^{\mathrm{dir}}$ is a map of directed edges satisfying $h_H(\varphi_E(e)) = \varphi_V(h_G(e))$ and $t_H(\varphi_E(e)) = \varphi_V(t_G(e))$ for all $e \in E_G^{\mathrm{dir}}$. We refer to the values of φ_V^{-1} as *vertex fibres* of φ, and similarly for edge fibres. We often more simply write φ instead of φ_V or φ_E.

A *morphism of graphs* is defined as a morphism of the underlying directed graphs, with the additional requirement that $\iota_H(\varphi(e)) = \varphi(\iota_G(e))$ for all $e \in E_G^{\mathrm{dir}}$.

The above definitions make graphs and directed graphs into a category; in both cases, there is a terminal element, namely a graph or directed graph with one vertex and one edge.

DEFINITION 1.1.5. An *oriented graph* is an undirected graph, G, with an orientation of each of its edges. In this context, when referring to an edge $e \in E_G$ we always assume it represents its underlying directed edge and hence extend the language of directed edges to this edge (so it has a tail and a head map) and we denote by e^{-1} its opposite directed edge.

1.1.2. Walks and Traces. The traces of powers of many interesting matrices can be understood as counting certain types of *walks*.

DEFINITION 1.1.6. Let $G = (V, E^{\mathrm{dir}}, t, h)$ be a directed graph and $k \geq 0$ an integer. A *walk of length k in G* is an alternating sequence of vertices and directed edges,

$$v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2, v_2, \ldots, e_k, v_k$$

for which $t_G(e_i) = v_{i-1}$ and $h_G(e_i) = v_i$. The vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_{k-1}$ are called the *interior vertices* of the walk. We say that a walk is *closed* if $v_0 = v_k$.

A in a graph is a walk in the underlying directed graph. In this case

$$v_k, e_k^{-1}, v_{k-1}, \ldots, v_2, e_1^{-1}, v_1$$

is also a walk, which we call the reverse walk (or *inverse walk*) of w, which we denote w^{-1}. We say that a walk, as above, in a graph, G, is

(1) *non-backtracking* (or *irreducible*) if $\iota(e_{i+1}) \neq e_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, k-1$,
(2) *strictly non-backtracking closed* (or *strongly irreducible*) if it is non-backtracking, closed, and if $\iota(e_k) \neq e_1$ (we cannot have $\iota(e_k) = e_1$ if the walk is not closed).
(3) *beaded path* if it is non-backtracking and all interior vertices are traversed once, and all interior vertices have degree two in the graph.

A walk of length at least one can be identified with its sequence of edges; a walk of length zero is simply a vertex.

Our main interest lies in the algebraic properties of graphs. We review some definitions of algebraic graph theory.

DEFINITION 1.1.7. Let G be a directed graph. The *adjacency matrix*, A_G, of G is the square matrix indexed on the vertices, V_G, whose (v_1, v_2) entry is the number of directed edges whose tail is the vertex v_1 and whose head is the vertex v_2. The

indegree (respectively *outdegree*) of a vertex, v, of G is the number of edges whose head (respectively tail) is v.

The adjacency matrix of an undirected graph, G, is simply the adjacency matrix of its underlying directed graph. For an undirected graph, the indegree of any vertex equals its outdegree, and is just called its *degree*. The *degree matrix* of G is the diagonal matrix, D_G, indexed on V_G whose (v, v) entry is the degree of v. We say that G is *d-regular* if D_G is d times the identity matrix, i.e., if each vertex of G has degree d.

For any non-negative integer k, the number of closed walks of length k is a graph, G, is just the trace, $\mathrm{Tr}(A_G^k)$, of the k-th power of A_G.

NOTATION 1.1.8. Given a graph, G, the matrix A_G is symmetric, and hence the eigenvalues of A_G are real and can be ordered

$$\lambda_1(G) \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n(G),$$

where $n = |V_G|$. We reserve the notation $\lambda_i(G)$ to denote the eigenvalues of A_G ordered as above. When G is a directed graph, we let $\lambda_1(G)$ be the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of A_G, and, for $i = 2, \ldots, n$, let $\lambda_i(G)$ be the remaining eigenvalues of A_G in no particular order (all concepts we discuss about the λ_i for $i \geq 2$ will not depend on their order).

DEFINITION 1.1.9. Let G be a graph. We define the *directed line graph* or *oriented line graph* of G, denoted $\mathrm{Line}(G)$, to be the directed graph $L = \mathrm{Line}(G) = (V_L, E_L^{\mathrm{dir}}, t_L, h_L)$ given as follows: its vertex set, V_L, is the set E_G^{dir} of directed edges of G; its set of directed edges is defined by

$$E_L^{\mathrm{dir}} = \left\{(e_1, e_2) \in E_G^{\mathrm{dir}} \times E_G^{\mathrm{dir}} \mid h_G(e_1) = t_G(e_2) \text{ and } \iota_G(e_1) \neq e_2\right\}$$

that is, E_L^{dir} corresponds to the non-backtracking walks of length two in G. The tail and head maps are simply defined to be the projections in each component, that is by $t_L(e_1, e_2) = e_1$ and $h_L(e_1, e_2) = e_2$.

The *Hashimoto matrix* of G is the adjacency matrix of its directed line graph, denoted H_G, which is, therefore, a square matrix indexed on E_G^{dir}. We use the symbol $\mu_1(G)$ to denote the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of H_G, and use $\mu_2(G), \ldots, \mu_m(G)$, where $m = |E_G^{\mathrm{dir}}|$, to denote the remaining eigenvalues, in no particular order (all concepts we discuss about the μ_i for $i \geq 2$ will not depend on their order).

It is easy to see that for any positive integer k, the number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks of length k in a graph, G, equals the trace, $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$, of the k power of H_G; of course, the strictly non-backtracking walks begin and end in a vertex, whereas $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$ most naturally counts walks beginning and ending in an edge; the correspondence between the two notions can be seen by taking a walk of $\mathrm{Line}(G)$, beginning and ending an in a directed edge, $e \in E_G^{\mathrm{dir}}$, and mapping it to the strictly non-backtracking closed walk in G beginning at, say, the tail of e.

For graphs, G, that have half-loops, the Ihara determinantal formula takes the form (see [**Fri08, ST96, ST00, TS07**]):

$$\det(\mu I - H_G) = \det\big(\mu^2 I - \mu A_G + (D_G - I)\big)(\mu - 1)^{|\mathrm{half}_G|}(\mu^2 - 1)^{|V_G| - |\mathrm{pair}_G|}, \tag{1.1}$$

where half_G is the set of half-loops of G, and pair_G is the set of undirected edges of G that are not half-loops, i.e., the collection of sets of the form, $\{e_1, e_2\}$ with $\iota e_1 = e_2$ but $e_1 \neq e_2$.

1.1.3. Covering and Etale (Open Immersion) Maps. Here we discuss spectral aspects of covering maps of graphs. We also define *étale maps*[1], a closely related concept which shall be of interest in Subsection 1.2.4, to understand which graphs can occur as subgraphs of a graph in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ (with positive probability).

DEFINITION 1.1.10. A morphism of directed graphs $\nu\colon H \to G$ is a *covering map* (respectively, *étale map*) local isomorphism (respectively, injection), that is for any vertex $w \in V_H$, the edge morphism ν_E induces a bijection (respectively, injection) between $t_H^{-1}(w)$ and $t_G^{-1}(\nu(w))$ and a bijection (respectively, injection) between $h_H^{-1}(w)$ and $h_G^{-1}(\nu(w))$. We call G the *base graph* and H a *covering graph of* G (respectively, *graph étale over* G).

If $\nu\colon H \to G$ is a covering map and G is connected, then the *degree* of ν, denoted $[H\colon G]$, is the number of preimages of a vertex or edge in G under ν (which does not depend on the vertex or edge). If G is not connected, we insist that the number of preimages of ν of a vertex or edge is the same, i.e., the degree is independent of the connected component, and we will write this number as $[H\colon G]$. In addition, we often refer to H, without ν mentioned explicitly, as a *covering graph* of G.

A morphism of graphs is a *covering map* (respectively, *étale map*) if the morphism of the underlying directed graphs is a covering map (respectively, étale map).

Clearly a composition of two covering maps is a covering map, and similarly for étale maps. Any covering map is étale; also, any inclusion of a subgraph of a graph (to the graph) is étale. In particular, any morphism that is the composition of an inclusion with a covering map is étale; it is not hard to see that the converse is true (see, for example, [**Sta83, Fri**], or Proposition 1.1.15 below). The necessary ideas to prove this are also necessary for us to define what we call the *Broder-Shamir* model, $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, for arbitrary integer n and graph B (possibly with half-loops); hence we develop these ideas now.

DEFINITION 1.1.11. Let B be a graph. By a *permutation assignment of degree n over B* we mean a map $\sigma\colon E_B^{\mathrm{dir}} \to \mathcal{S}_n$, where $\mathcal{S}_n$ is the set of permutations on $\{1,\dots,n\}$, such that $\sigma(\iota_B e) = \sigma(e)^{-1}$ for all $e \in E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}$. By a *standard covering of degree n over B* we mean the data (π,μ) where $\pi\colon G \to B$ is a covering map of degree n, and

$$\mu\colon V_G \to V_B \times \{1,\dots,n\}$$

is a bijection. To each such standard covering we associate a permutation assignment by the "tails-to-heads" map, meaning for each edge, $e \in E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}$, we get a permutation, $\sigma(e)$, such that for each $i \in \{1,\dots,n\}$ we have that $(t(e),i)$ is the tail of an edge whose head is $(h(e),\sigma(e)i)$.

The following proposition is easy, but useful.

PROPOSITION 1.1.12. *If B is a graph, and V_G is a set and μ a set theoretic bijection,*

$$\mu\colon V_G \to V_B \times \{1,\dots,n\},$$

then any permutation assignment $\sigma\colon E_B^{\mathrm{dir}} \to \mathcal{S}_n$ determines a unique graph, up to isomorphism, $G = (V_G, E_G, t_G, h_G, \iota_G)$ with a covering map, $\pi\colon G \to B$, such that σ is the permutation assignment associated to (π,μ).

[1]Some articles, such as [**Sta83**], prefer the term "open immersion" to "étale," which are identical concepts in this context.

PROOF. It suffices to consider the case where V_G equals $V_B \times \{1, \dots, n\}$ and μ is the identity map. In this case we set

$$E_G = E_B \times \{1, \dots, n\},$$

and define

$$t_G(e, i) = (t_B(e), i) \quad \text{and} \quad h_G(e, i) = (h_B(e), \sigma(e)i),$$

and $\iota_G(e, i) = (\iota_B(e), \sigma(e)i)$. Then the map $E_G \to E_B$ via projection gives a covering map $G \to B$.

If $\pi' \colon G' \to B$ and $\mu' \colon V_{G'} \to \{1, \dots, n\}$ is any other pair of a covering map of, π', of degree n, and an isomorphism, μ' yielding the same permutation assignment, it is straightforward to verify that G' is isomorphic to G: namely, for such π' and μ' we get a natural set theoretic isomorphism $\alpha \colon E_{G'} \to E_G$ such that for $e' \in E_{G'}$, $\alpha(e')$ is the unique edge whose tail is $\mu'(t_{G'} e')$ and whose head is $\mu'(h_{G'} e')$; then we verify that α and μ' intertwine the tails and heads maps and the graph involution. □

The following proposition is noteworthy but immediate, so we state it without proof.

PROPOSITION 1.1.13. *If B is a graph, then a set theoretic map $\sigma \colon E_B^{\mathrm{dir}} \to \{1, \dots, n\}$ is a permutation assignment iff for each $e \in E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}$ we have (1) if e is a half-loop, we have $\sigma(i)$ is an involution (i.e., a permutation equal to its inverse), and (2) if e is not a half-loop, then $\sigma(e)$ is an arbitrary permutation and $\sigma(\iota_B e)$ is the inverse permutation.*

Now we give analogous notions of standard coverings for étale maps.

DEFINITION 1.1.14. By a *standard étale map of degree n over B* we mean the data (π, μ) where $\pi \colon G \to B$ is an étale map, and

$$\mu \colon V_G \to V_B \times \{1, \dots, n\}$$

is an injection. To each such standard covering we associate a *partially defined permutation assignment*, meaning that for each $e \in E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}$, we have a *partially defined permutation*, i.e., a map, $\sigma(e)$, defined on those integers, i, for which $(t(e), i)$ is in the image of μ (and, in this case, $\sigma(e)i$ is the unique integer such that the edge over e with tail $(t(e), i)$ has head $(h(e), \sigma(e)i)$); furthermore, these partially defined permutations satisfy the property that for each such e and i, we have $\sigma(\iota_B e)$ is defined on $\sigma(e)i$ and equals i.

PROPOSITION 1.1.15. *Let $\pi \colon G' \to B$ be an étale morphism of graphs, and let n_0 be the maximum vertex fibre of π. Then π factors as an inclusion following by a covering map, and the degree of the covering map can be any integer, n, for which $n \geq n_0$.*

PROOF. Let $n \geq n_0$. Our goal is to describe a graph, G'', for which G' can be identified as a subgraph of G'', and for which G'' has a covering map to B of degree n; first we describe $V_{G''}$, and then $E_{G''}$.

Set

$$V_{G''} = V_B \times \{1, \dots, n\},$$

for each vertex, $v \in V_B$, take an arbitrary injection, $\pi^{-1}(v) \to \{1, \dots, n\}$; these injections gives rise to an injection

$$\mu \colon V_{G'} \to V_B \times \{1, \dots, n\} = V_{G''}.$$

This gives us a partially defined involution, $\sigma(e)$, for each half-loop, $e \in E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}$, and partially defined permutations, $\sigma(e)$ on edges, $e \in E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}$ that are not half-loops, with $\sigma(e)$ and $\sigma(\iota_B e)$ being inverses of each other. It is clear that any partially defined involution or permutation extends to a (fully defined) involution or permutation on $\{1, \dots, n\}$; doing so for all the $\sigma(e)$ here (in any way) gives G'' the structure of a covering graph to B (for each $e \in E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}$ with $e \in \iota_B(e)$, we first extend either $\sigma(e)$ or $\sigma(\iota_B e)$ to a full permutation, and infer the other permutation given that the two permutations are inverses of each other). Furthermore, the injection μ on vertices extends to an injection of graphs, $G' \to G''$, in view of how we partially defined $\sigma(e)$ above. □

We remark that the partially defined permutations in the above proof are crucial to Proposition 2.3.8, which will be our fundamental starting point to all our "$1/n$-asymptotic expansions."

Covering maps have distinguished spectral properties, which we now discuss.

Definition 1.1.16. If $\pi\colon G \to B$ is a covering map of directed graphs, then an *old function (on V_G)* is a function on V_G arising via pullback from B, i.e., a function $f\pi$, where f is a function (usually real or complex valued), i.e., a function on V_G (usually real or complex valued) whose value depends only on the π vertex fibres. A *new function (on V_G)* is a function whose sum on each vertex fibre is zero. The space of all functions (real or complex) on V_G is a direct sum of the old and new functions, an orthogonal direct sum on the natural inner product on V_G, i.e.,

$$(f_1, f_2) = \sum_{v \in V_G} \overline{f_1(v)} f_2(v).$$

The adjacency matrix, A_G, viewed as an operator, takes old functions to old functions and new functions to new functions. The *new spectrum* of A_G, which we often denote $\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)$, is the spectrum of A_G restricted to the new functions; we similarly define the *old spectrum*. As mentioned before, (0.2) shows that when G is finite, the new spectrum, meaning the eigenvalues with their multiplicities, is independent of the covering map.

This discussion holds, of course, equally well if $\pi\colon G \to B$ is a covering morphism of graphs, by doing everything over the underlying directed graphs.

We can make similar definitions for the spectrum of the Hashimoto eigenvalues. First, we observe that covering maps induce covering maps on directed line graphs; let us state this formally (the proof is easy).

Proposition 1.1.17. *Let $\pi\colon G \to B$ be a covering map. Then π induces a covering map $\pi^{\mathrm{Line}}\colon \mathrm{Line}(G) \to \mathrm{Line}(B)$.*

Since $\mathrm{Line}(G)$ and $\mathrm{Line}(B)$ are directed graphs, the above discussion of new and old functions, etc., holds for $\pi^{\mathrm{Line}}\colon \mathrm{Line}(G) \to \mathrm{Line}(B)$; e.g., new and old functions are functions on the vertices of $\mathrm{Line}(G)$, or, equivalently, on E_G^{dir}.

Definition 1.1.18. Let $\pi\colon G \to B$ be a covering map. We define the *new Hashimoto spectrum of G with respect to B*, denoted $\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(H_G)$ to be the spectrum of the Hashimoto matrix restricted to the new functions on $\mathrm{Line}(G)$, and $\rho_B^{\mathrm{new}}(H_G)$ to be the supremum of the norms of $\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(H_G)$.

Again, similar to (0.2), we have

$$\sum_{\mu\in\mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(H_G)} \mu^k = \mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k) - \mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k),$$

and hence the new Hashimoto spectrum is independent of the covering map from G to B.

1.1.4. Variable-Length Graphs. Variable-length graphs will be used to define our *certified trace* and to prove theorems regarding their expected values. We refer to [**Fri08**], Subsection 3.2 for basic facts on variable-length graphs. We shall briefly state the facts we need.

DEFINITION 1.1.19. Let G be a directed graph, and $\vec{k}$ a vector indexed on E^{dir} with non-negative integer components. We refer to the tuple $(G,\vec{k})$ as a *variable-length graph*, which we view as the data of a directed graph where each edge is given a non-negative real *length*; for $e\in E^{\mathrm{dir}}$, $\vec{k}(e)$ is called the *length of* e. Furthermore, we define the *realization of a variable-length graph*, $(G,\vec{k})$, which we denote $\mathrm{VLG}(G,\vec{k})$, to be the directed graph obtained by replacing each $e\in E^{\mathrm{dir}}$ by a directed path of length $\vec{k}(e)$; in other words, we replace each edge, $e\in E^{\mathrm{dir}}$, by $k=\vec{k}(e)$ new directed edges, $e_1,\ldots,e_k$, and $k-1$ new vertices, $v_1,\ldots,v_{k-1}$, so that each new vertex has indegree and outdegree one, and such that

$$t(e),e_1,v_1,e_2,v_2,\ldots,e_{k-1},v_{k-1},e_k,h(e)$$

is a walk in the graph, i.e., for all $i=1,\ldots,k-1$ we have $t(e_i)=v_{i-1}$ and $h(e_i)=v_i$, with the understanding that $v_0=t(e)$ and $v_k=h(e)$.

If G is a graph without half-loops, and $\vec{k}$ a vector indexed in E_G with non-negative integral components, we make a similar definition; namely, we define the variable-length graph as the a function $\vec{k}\colon E_G\to\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and $\mathrm{VLG}(G,\vec{k})$ as the graph obtained by replacing each edge $e\in E_G$ by a path of length $k=\vec{k}(e)$; in other words, we replace e and $\iota_G e$ with with k new edges, $e_1,\ldots,e_{k-1}$ and $k-1$ new vertices of degree two, $v_1,\ldots,v_{k-1}$ such that for $i=1,\ldots,k-1$, e_i is incident upon v_{i-1} and v_i, with the understanding that v_0 and v_k are the two endpoints of the discarded edge e.

We remark that when G has half-loops, which only occurs when B has half-loops, namely in Subsection 3.4.1, a type remembers all the half-loops; hence, all the half-loops are unaltered, i.e., restricted to having length one. Hence, in this article we understand that if G has half-loops, the VLG's we form from G leave all half-loops alone, and we define lengths only on the edges of G which are not half-loops.

There is a well-known *Shannon's algorithm* for computing $\lambda_1(\mathrm{VLG}(G,\vec{k}))$ (see [**Fri08**]). We shall need only the following facts.

PROPOSITION 1.1.20 (Monotonicity). *If G is a directed graph, and $\vec{k},\vec{k}'$ are both functions from E_G^{dir} with $\vec{k}\leq\vec{k}'$, i.e., $\vec{k}(e)\leq\vec{k}'(e)$ for all $e\in E_G^{\mathrm{dir}}$, then $\lambda_1(\mathrm{VLG}(G,\vec{k}))\geq\lambda_1(\mathrm{VLG}(G,\vec{k}'))$. Similarly for graphs.*

PROPOSITION 1.1.21 (Continuity). *Let G be a directed graph, let $e\in E^{\mathrm{dir}}$, and let $\vec{k}_1,\vec{k}_2,\ldots$ be functions from $E^{\mathrm{dir}}\to\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that $\vec{k}_n(e)=n$ and $\vec{k}_i(e')=\vec{k}_j(e')$*

for any i, j and any $e' \in E^{\mathrm{dir}}$ with $e' \neq e$. Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_1\big(\mathrm{VLG}(G, \vec{k}_n)\big) = \lambda_1\big(\mathrm{VLG}(G', \vec{k}')\big),$$

where G' is G with e discarded, and $\vec{k}'$ is the restriction of $\vec{k}_n$ to $E^{\mathrm{dir}}_{G'}$ (which is independent of n). Similarly for graphs, G.

1.1.5. The Broder-Shamir Model and Related Models. For a graph, B, and a positive integer n, we give a model of random cover of B of degree n which slightly generalizes the model used in [**Fri03**]. As mentioned before, throughout Chapter 2 we assume that B has no half-loops, and in the case the Broder-Shamir model is formed from $|E_B|$ independently and uniformly chosen elements of S_n, the group of permutations on n elements, in the natural fashion.

Hence, the main point of this section is to give the reader some idea of some of the various random covering models to which our main theorems, Theorem 0.1.1 and 0.1.3, apply, especially when B may contain half-loops. All this will be elaborated upon (with proofs) in Section 3.4.

Recall the definition of a permutation assignment and standard covering, in Definition 1.1.11

Definition 1.1.22. Let B be a graph. To each permutation assignment $\sigma\colon E_B^{\mathrm{dir}} \to \mathcal{S}_n$, we associate a graph covering, $\pi[\sigma]\colon B[\sigma] \to B$, of degree n as follows: $B[\sigma]$ is the graph given by

$$V_{B[\sigma]} = V_B \times \{1, \ldots, n\} \quad \text{and} \quad E_{B[\sigma]} = E_B \times \{1, \ldots, n\};$$

the respective tail and head maps of $B[\sigma]$ take (e, i) to $(t_B(e), i)$ and $(h_B(e), \sigma(e)i)$ respectively; the involution map takes (e, i) to $(\iota_B e, \sigma(\iota_B e)i)$; and, finally, the covering map $\pi[\sigma]\colon B[\sigma] \to B$ is given by the natural map, i.e., projection onto the first component. In other words, $B[\sigma] \to B$ is just the graph covering determined by Proposition 1.1.12 where μ is the identity map.

By the *Broder-Shamir model of degree n over B*, denoted $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ we mean the probability space of permutation assignments, σ, such that

(1) for each $e \in E^{\mathrm{dir}}$, σ_e is independent of all $\sigma_{e'}$ for e' not equal to e or $\iota_B e$;
(2) if e is not a half-loop, then σ_e is uniform over all permutations;
(3) for each $e \in E^{\mathrm{dir}}$ that is a half-loop, if n is even we set σ_e to be chosen uniformly among all involutions that have no fixed points; and
(4) for each $e \in E^{\mathrm{dir}}$ that is a half-loop, if n is odd we set σ_e to be chosen uniformly among all involutions that have exactly one fixed point.

When confusion is unlikely to arise, we also use $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ to mean the induced probability space of covering maps, $\pi[\sigma]$, with notation as above, and of covering graphs, $B[\sigma]$ as above.

The above Broder-Shamir model is very similar to some of models discussed in [**Fri03, Fri08**]. Broder and Shamir defined this model in [**BS87**] in the case where $B = W_{d/2}$, i.e., where B the graph with one vertex and $d/2$ whole-loops, for an even integer $d \geq 4$; the above definition seems like the simplest extension of Broder and Shamir's definition to the case where B is an arbitrary graph; however, our definition when n is odd and B contains half-loops is a bit ad hoc, and our choice (like that in [**Fri08**] for B consisting of one vertex and d half-loops) is chosen mostly to suit our methods. In Chapter 2 we will assume, for simplicity, that B has no half-loops.

There are many variants of the above model for which all of our main theorems hold. The main general requirement we need of a model is a certain "algebraic" property; see Section 3.4. We will not formalize this, but the basic idea can be described as follows: the probability that a uniformly chosen $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_n$ assumes any k particular values is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n(n-1)\dots(n-k+1)} &= n^{-k}\big(1-n^{-1}\big)^{-1}\dots\big(1-(k-1)n^{-1}\big)^{-1} \\ &= n^{-k}p_0(k)+n^{-k-1}p_1(k)+\cdots \end{aligned}$$

where $p_0, p_1, \dots$ are polynomials (p_i is of degree $2i$); for example, $p_0(k)=1$ and $p_1(k)=\binom{k}{2}$; see [**Fri91**]. A similar example arises when we permit the base graph to have half-loops and n is even; one way to generate a random $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}_n$ is to insist that φ is chosen among all involutions without fixed points. In this case $\varphi(i)=j$ implies that $\varphi(j)=i$, so that to φ values are specified in pairs. Any specified k pairs of φ values (i.e., any $2k$ values of φ) occurs with probability

$$\frac{1}{(n-1)(n-3)\dots(n-2k+1)} = n^{-k}\tilde{p}_0(k)+n^{-k-1}\tilde{p}_1(k)+\cdots$$

for polynomials $\tilde{p}_0, \tilde{p}_1, \dots$ in k. Roughly speaking, the "algebraic" property requires that the probability that fixing certain values of the permutations of $\mathcal{S}_n$ under consideration gives rise to power series in $1/n$ with coefficients that are polynomials in the number of values fixed. However, this is not strictly necessary: indeed, our Broder-Shamir models for a covering of degree n with n odd yield two types of values for a permutation for a half-loop: (1) the single value that is a fixed point, and (2) the remaining $n-1$ values, which essentially pairs all the remaining values into $(n-1)/2$ pairs. In this case, the probabilities depend on whether or not the fixed values include the unique fixed point or not; of course, either case yields probabilities that have algebraic power series of the type discussed above.

Similarly, the models we work with generally assume that all permutations given by σ (chosen over a set of representatives of E_B in E_B^{dir}) are chosen independently. Again, this is not strictly necessary; see Section 3.4.

1.2. Remarks on the Trace Method

In this section we review some aspects of the trace method of Broder-Shamir [**BS87**] and its various strengthenings [**Fri91, Fri03, LP10, Fri08, Pud12**]. In order to do so, we shall also give some precise definitions and terminology used throughout this paper.

We shall make one remark that appears to be new: one gets improved spectral bounds by first working with traces of powers of the Hashimoto matrix, and then translating the spectral bounds to adjacency matrix bounds.

Having given some precise definitions in Section 1.1, we can now give an overview of trace methods in this article and previous article.

1.2.1. Broder and Shamir's Method: A Single Moment Estimate. In this subsection we describe how expected traces generally give eigenvalue results, as in [**BS87, Fri91, Fri03, LP10, Pud12**].

The first works [**BS87, Fri91**] considered d-regular random graphs with d even, i.e., base graph $B = W_{d/2}$, the bouquet of $d/2$ permutations. The methods

of Broder and Shamir [**BS87**] show that for fixed, even d, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathrm{Tr}(A_G^k)] = P_{-1}(k)n + P_0(k) + \mathrm{err}(n,k), \tag{1.2}$$

where for fixed d (i.e., $B = W_{d/2}$ fixed) we have

(1) $P_{-1}(k)$ is the number of closed walks of length k originating at any vertex in the (infinite) d-regular tree;
(2) we have

$$P_0(k) = d^k + e_0(k), \tag{1.3}$$

with

$$|e_0(k)| \le Ck^C\left(2\sqrt{d-1}\right)^k;$$

and
(3) $\mathrm{err}(n,k)$ satisfies the bound

$$|\mathrm{err}(n,k)| \le Ck^2d^k/n.$$

With these bounds one can show that[2] for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\sup_{i>1}|\lambda_i(G)| < \left(d\,2\sqrt{d-1}\right)^{1/2} + \epsilon\Big], \tag{1.4}$$

with $B = W_{d/2}$ fixed, tends to one.

Once we have (1.2), we simply choose an even integer k so that the $P_{-1}(k)n$ term and the $\mathrm{err}(n,k)$ term are roughly equal. In other words, we find a sort of trace estimate, which is interesting for many values of k for a given n; however, for each value of n we apply (1.2) for a single value of k (of size proportional to $\log n$).

1.2.2. Friedman's Asymptotic Expansions. Friedman [**Fri91**] builds on the methods in [**BS87**] to obtain the same result with the

$$\left(d\,2\sqrt{d-1}\right)^{1/2}$$

in (1.4) replaced with

$$d^{1/(r+1)}\left(2\sqrt{d-1}\right)^{r/(r+1)} \tag{1.5}$$

for any integer r satisfying

$$r < 1 + \sqrt{d-1}/2 \tag{1.6}$$

(see Theorem 2.18 of [**Fri91**], noting that the r and d here are $r+1$ and $d/2$ in [**Fri91**]); this represents an improvement in [**BS87**] for $d \ge 6$.

Now we wish to explain some important similarities and differences between [**BS87**] and [**Fri91**].

Both [**BS87**] and [**Fri91**] are similar as follows:

(1) both articles first estimate the expected number of non-backtracking walks of a given length in the graph; non-backtracking walks are fundamentally easier to analyze in the method of [**BS87**], used in [**Fri91**], and related papers [**Fri91, Fri03, Fri08**]; the papers [**BS87, Fri91**], and, for that

[2]The bound in [**BS87**] is slightly weaker since they use a slightly suboptimal bound on the number of closed walks of length k originating at any vertex in the d-regular tree; this affects their $P_{-1}(k)$ estimate.

matter, [**Fri03**], then translate such estimates into estimates for the trace of powers of

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathrm{Tr}(A_G^k)];$$

(2) both obtain estimates for

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathrm{Tr}(A_G^k)],$$

for many values of k for a given n, but then for any given n the estimates are applied for a single value of k, whose size is proportional to $\log n$;

The main difference between [**BS87**] and [**Fri91**] is that [**BS87**] gives its estimates on $P_{-1}(k)$, $P_0(k)$, and $\mathrm{err}(k,n)$ by explicit calculations; on the other hand, the estimates in [**Fri91**] follow a two-step process: it is shown that the expected number of non-backtracking closed walks of length k in a $G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is given by an asymptotic series

$$Q_0(k)+Q_1(k)n^{-1}+Q_2(k)n^{-2}+\cdots+Q_{r-1}(k)n^{-r+1}+\mathrm{err}(k,n),$$

for any r satisfying (1.6), where for some constant, C (depending only on r and $B=W_{d/2}$)

$$|\mathrm{err}(k,n)|\leq Ck^C(d-1)^k n^{-r}$$

and each $Q_i(k)$ is given as

$$Q_i(k)=(d-1)^k p_i(k)+e_i(k) \tag{1.7}$$

where each $p_i(k)$ is a polynomial in k and the $e_i(k)$ are "error terms" bounded as

$$|e_i(k)|\leq Ck^C(d-1)^{k/2};$$

the second phase is to prove, by other considerations, that all the polynomials, $p_i(k)$ must vanish (provided r satisfies (1.6)); see Theorem 2.18 of [**Fri91**]. We stress that one arrives at (1.7) by some calculations that give, in principle, a method to compute the each of the polynomials, $p_i(k)$; however such computations, especially for large i, are quite cumbersome, and one infers the precise polynomials $p_i(k)$ by a different method, namely known expansion properties of random graphs, and what this implies about the $p_i(k)$ (i.e., that they must vanish). Such "non-explicit methods" occur also in [**Fri08**] and in this article.

We point out the similarity between (1.3) and (1.7); in both cases the coefficients $P_0(k)$ and $Q_i(k)$ have a "principle" (or "term"), and an "error term;" for the expected number of walks (i.e., expected $\mathrm{Tr}(A_G^k)$), the dominant term is roughly of order d^k, and the error term of order $(2(d-1)^{1/2})^k$; for non-backtracking walks, the analogous principle term is roughly of size $(d-1)^k$, and analogous error term is roughly of size $(d-1)^{k/2}$.

1.2.3. Hashimoto Traces Give an Improvement. One point seems to have been unnoticed at present, or at least certainly in [**BS87, Fri91**]: for d-regular graphs, one gets a better high probability bound for the subdominant adjacency eigenvalues by first getting a such a bound for subdominant Hashimoto eigenvalues, and then translating the results to the adjacency matrix.

Indeed, consider the Broder-Shamir results in [**BS87**]: there they divide the non-backtracking closed walks into three types: (1) those that trace out a cycle (which we review here in Section 1.3), (2) those that trace out a cycle plus a segment, and (3) those that trace out a graph whose Euler characteristic is at most minus one. The walks of type (2) represent a closed walk that is not strictly non-backtracking.

Hence, in estimating the expected number of strictly non-backtracking walks of length k, i.e., the expected value of $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$, we obtain the bound

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(W_{d/2})}[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)] \leq (d-1)^k + Ck(d-1)^{k/2} + Ck^4(d-1)^k n^{-1}, \tag{1.8}$$

the first two summands coming from walks of type (1) (essentially from Theorem 11 of [**BS87**], compare to our discussion in Section 1.3), and the last summand from walks of type (3) (see Lemma 3 of [**BS87**]). But since G is d-regular, we know that the eigenvalues of H_G either have absolute value $(d-1)^{1/2}$ (generally complex), of which there are at most $2n-2$, or real and of absolute value at most $d-1$. It follows that for any d-regular graph we have for any even k, either

$$\max_{i>1} |\mu_i(G)|^k = (d-1)^{k/2} \tag{1.9}$$

(iff G is Ramanujan and non-bipartite) or

$$\max_{i>1} |\mu_i(G)|^k \leq \mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k) + (2n-2)(d-1)^{k/2}. \tag{1.10}$$

However, we claim that (1.9) implies (1.10) if $n \geq 2$: indeed, $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$ counts certain walks (i.e., strictly non-backtracking closed walks) and is therefore always non-negative; and if $n \geq 2$ then $2n-2 \geq 1$, and our claim follows. Hence in all cases we have that (1.10) holds. Taking expectations in (1.10) yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\max_{i>1} |\mu_i(G)|^k\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\right] + (2n-2)(d-1)^k.$$

But using (1.8) yields, and the fact that $\mu_1(G) = d-1$, yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\max_{i>1} |\mu_i(G)|^k\right] \leq Ck(d-1)^{k/2} + Ck^4(d-1)^k n^{-1} + (2n-2)(d-1)^{k/2}.$$

Now choosing k an even integer to have the terms $(2n-2)(d-1)^{k/2}$ and $(d-1)^k/n$ roughly equal shows that for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\sup_{i>1} |\mu_i(G)| > (d-1)^{3/4} + \epsilon\right]$$

tends to zero as $n \to \infty$. Using the relation

$$\mu^2 - \lambda\mu + (d-1) = 0, \quad \text{or} \quad \lambda = \mu + (d-1)/\mu,$$

we see that this gives that for any $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\sup_{i>1} |\lambda_i(G)| > (d-1)^{3/4} + (d-1)^{1/4} + \epsilon\right] \tag{1.11}$$

tends to zero. The above is an improvement over (1.4), which for large d is a multiplicative factor of roughly $2^{1/2}$.

Similarly, for a value of r satisfying (1.6), we can improve the result of Friedman [**Fri91**] to obtain

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\sup_{i>1} |\lambda_i(G)| > (d-1)^{(r+2)/(2r+2)} + (d-1)^{r/(2r+2)} + \epsilon\right] \tag{1.12}$$

For large d, this represents an improvement over the bound in [**Fri91**] of a multiplicative factor of roughly $2^{r/(r+1)}$.

1.2.4. Tangles and the Limitations of the Trace Method. Here we define one of the main concepts in this article and in [**Fri08**]. Friedman, in [**Fri08**], introduced various notions of "tangles" in random graphs, to remedy various shortcomings of the trace method. Let us introduce the basic notions. Throughout this subsection, we work with a fixed connected graph, B, without half-loops, and assume that $\chi(B) \leq -1$; in this case the Broder-Shamir model, $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, is formed via $|E_B|$ independent and uniformly chosen permutations on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. We begin with a somewhat technical point.

DEFINITION 1.2.1. Let B be a graph without half-loops. We let the *subgraphs occurring in a B covering*, denoted Occurs_B to be those graphs, ψ, such that for some $n \geq 1$, ψ occurs as a subgraph of some $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ (i.e., a graph that occurs with positive probability in B).

The following observation is not strictly needed for our main theorems, but sheds light on the set Occurs_B.

PROPOSITION 1.2.2. *Let B be a graph without half-loops. Then Occurs_B is precisely the set of graphs, ψ, that admit an étale map to B.*

PROOF. If ψ occurs as a subgraph of some $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then the natural projection $G \to B$ gives an étale graph morphism $\psi \to B$. The converse was proven in Proposition 1.1.15. □

DEFINITION 1.2.3. By the *order* of a graph, ψ, we mean

$$\text{ord}(\psi) = -\chi(\psi) = |E_\psi| - |V_\psi|.$$

DEFINITION 1.2.4. Let B be a connected graph of negative Euler characteristic. By a *tangle of B* or simply *B-tangle* we mean a connected graph, $\psi \in \text{Occurs}_B$, for which

$$\rho(H_\psi) \geq \rho^{1/2}(H_B),$$

where $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$ denotes the square root of $\rho(H_B)$; furthermore, we say that a ψ as above is a strict tangle of B if $\rho(H_\psi) > \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$. We use Tangle_B to denote the set of B-tangles, and $\text{Tangle}_{<r,B}$ to denote those tangles of order less than r. Similarly, for any $\epsilon > 0$ we define a *(B, ϵ)-tangle* to be those graphs, ψ, for which

$$\rho(H_\psi) \geq \rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \epsilon,$$

and use the notation $\text{Tangle}_{B,\epsilon}$ and $\text{Tangle}_{<r,B,\epsilon}$ analogously.

We wish to make a few remarks regarding these definitions. If ψ is a connected, non-empty graph without half-loops, then we will see that:

(1) if $\text{ord}(\psi) < 0$ then $\text{ord}(\psi) = -1$, in which case ψ is a tree (we consider an "isolated vertex," i.e., the graph with one vertex and no edges, to be a tree), and in this case $\rho(\psi) = 0$;
(2) if $\text{ord}(\psi) = 0$ then ψ is a *homotopy cycle* (i.e., homotopic to a connected graph, all of whose vertices have degree two), and in this case $\rho(H_\psi) = 1$; and
(3) if $\text{ord}(\psi) > 0$ then $\rho(H_\psi) > 1$.

Hence if B is connected and $\text{ord}(B) \geq 1$, then any B-tangle must have order at least one. Notice that if $G' \subset G$, i.e., G' is a subgraph of G, then for any non-negative integer, k, we have

$$\text{Tr}(H_{G'}^k) \leq \text{Tr}(H_G^k),$$

since these traces count strictly non-backtracking closed walks in, respectively, G' and G; hence

$$\rho(H_{G'}) \leq \rho(H_G). \tag{1.13}$$

In particular, for any graph, ψ with

$$\rho(H_\psi) > \rho^{1/2}(H_B),$$

we have that the set of all G that contain ψ as a subgraph have $\rho(H_G)$ bounded below and away from $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$.

From the above remarks we see that if G contains a (B,ϵ)-tangle, ψ, then $\rho(H_G)$ is bounded away from $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$. It turns out that, for this reason, to prove the relativized Alon conjecture for B, we will want to compute expected traces of powers of H_G where we first discard any graph, G, that contains a (B,ϵ)-tangle, for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$. It turns out that, for technical reasons, it is easier to discard all B-tangles, and in Chapter 2 we will do so. In Section 3.3, where we refine Theorem 0.1.1 to obtain the more precise Theorem 0.1.3, we will need to work with (B,ϵ)-Tanlges for small $\epsilon > 0$.

The article [**Fri08**] demonstrates two main points about B-tangles, where $B = W_{d/2}$, bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops (with d even): first, the trace method that applies a single value of k for each n in

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(W_{d/2})}[\mathrm{Tr}(A_G^k)] \qquad \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(W_{d/2})}[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)]$$

cannot yield the Alon conjecture, due to certain B-tangles; the second point—which which comprises most of the work in [**Fri08**]—is that a trace method which removes graphs with tangles from the expected values above can be adapted to yield the Alon conjecture. In this paper we show that the same is true when $W_{d/2}$ is replaced with any d-regular, connected graph with $d \geq 3$. Let us now give an overview of the our methods.

1.3. Asymptotic Expansions and The Loop

The Broder-Shamir result [**BS87**] of (0.7), for random graphs $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with $B = W_{d/2}$ fixed (and d even), has an analogue valid for all $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, given in [**Fri03**]. We shall need some of the tools used in [**Fri03**], specifically the tools used to prove Lemma 2.3 there. In this section we shall give review these tools and results, developing some in a more general context that we need here. Our discussion is a generalization of the discussion of a *loop* in Section 5.2 of [**Fri08**]; we remark that the term *loop* in [**BS87**] was used differently, namely as the number of *coincidences* in [**Fri91, Fri03, Fri08**] and here (which is one minus the Euler characteristic of the graph of a walk in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$).

Once we develop these tools, in the first part of this section, we will be in a better position to explain a number of concepts needed in this paper, such as *B-Ramanujan functions* and *$1/n$-asymptotic expansions*. Such an explanation is given in the latter part of this section.

1.3.1. The Expected Number of Loops. In [**BS87**], Broder and Shamir considered closed, non-backtracking walks and classified them by the "shape" or "type" of the graph that the walk traces out. Let us give some formal definitions.

DEFINITION 1.3.1. Let

$$w = (v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2, v_2, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$$

be a walk in a graph, G (so $v_i \in V_G$ and $e_i \in E_G^{\text{dir}}$). We define the *graph of a walk*, w, denoted $\text{Graph}(w)$, to be the subgraph of G consisting of the vertices and edges occurring in w.

We shall review the fundamental calculation of Broder and Shamir, adapted by Friedman in [**Fri03**] for the model $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$.

DEFINITION 1.3.2. Let w be a walk in a graph, G. We say that w is a *loop* if it is a strictly non-backtracking closed walk such that $\text{Graph}(w)$ is a cycle, i.e., a connected graph such that all vertices have degree two.

We remark that if w is a strictly non-backtracking closed walk in G, then each vertex in $\text{Graph}(w)$ has degree at least two; hence, either w is a loop, or $\text{Graph}(w)$ is a graph of negative Euler characteristic. In this section we will prove the following result.

THEOREM 1.3.3. *Let B be a connected graph of negative Euler characteristic. Let k be a positive integer, and let m be the smallest divisor of k that is greater than one. Then expected number of loops of length k in a graph of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is*

$$\text{Tr}(H_B^k) + O(k^2/n)\,\text{Tr}(H_B^k) + O(k)\,\text{Tr}\Big(H_B^{k/m}\Big)$$

for k^2/n sufficiently small, where this smallness and constants in the $O(\ )$ notation depend only on B.

THEOREM 1.3.4. *Let B be a connected graph of negative Euler characteristic. Then for any k, n with k^2/n sufficiently small we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\text{Tr}(H_G^k)\Big] = \text{Tr}(H_B^k) + O(k^4/n)\,\text{Tr}(H_B^k) + O(k)\,\text{Tr}\Big(H_B^{k/m}\Big),$$

where m is the smallest divisor of k greater than one.

Again, the proofs of these theorems follows the methods of [**Fri03**]; but here we generalize some of these methods in a form that we will need in this article.

1.3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3.3. In this section we prove Theorem 1.3.3.

For each loop, w, of length k in a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, $\text{Graph}(w)$ is a cycle in G whose length, k', divides k. Furthermore, the first k' steps of w, which we denote w', is a strictly non-backtracking closed walk that determines w and $\text{Graph}(w)$. (Notice that it is crucial that w is non-backtracking here.) Also, w' traces out k' distinct edges and vertices in G to form Graph(w), and the j-th vertex of w' is a tuple (i_j, v_j), where $i_j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $v_j \in V_B$; and the projection of w' to B is a strictly non-backtracking closed walk in B.

Let us now work backwards: consider a strictly non-backtracking closed walk w'' in B of length k' where k' divides k, and let us consider what is the expected number of walks, w, in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ whose projection to B is w''. The expected number of walks is the expected number of $i_j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, with $j = 0, \ldots, k'-1$ such that

(1) the vertices (i_j, v_j), $j = 0, \ldots, k'-1$ are distinct, and
(2) for each $j = 0, \ldots, k'-1$ the vertex (i_j, v_j) is connected to the vertex (i_{j+1}, v_{j+1}) be the $(j+1)$-th edge of w''.

The exact formula is given in Proposition 2.3.8; here it suffices to give crude upper and lower bounds the desired expected value as such: the vertices i_j clearly take on at most $n^{k'}$ values, and clearly at least

$$n(n-1)\dots(n-k'+1)$$

values (simply by choosing $i_0,\dots,i_{k'-1}$ to be distinct integers). The probability that they are connected by the desired edges is greater than $n^{-k'}$ (which would hold exactly if w'' consisted of distinct edges of B), and at most

$$\Big(n(n-1)\dots(n-k'+1)\Big)^{-1}$$

(which would hold if all edges of w'' were the same edge of B, which would necessarily be a whole-loop traversed in the same direction). Hence this expected value is between

$$1\Big(1-(1/n)\Big)\dots\Big(1-(k'-1)/n\Big)$$

and the reciprocal of the above expression. But inclusion/exclusion on k' events with probabilities i/n with $i=0,\dots,k'-1$ shows that

$$1\Big(1-(1/n)\Big)\dots\Big(1-(k'-1)/n\Big)$$

$$\geq 1-\Big(1+2+\dots+(k'-1)\Big)/n \geq 1-(k')^2/n;$$

hence its inverse is at most

$$1+(k')^2/n$$

for k^2/n sufficiently small.

Hence the total number of expected loops in $G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is

$$1+O(k')^2/n$$

summed over the number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks in B of length k. Since the divisors, k', of k consist of k and at most k other numbers, each no larger that k/m, the theorem follows.

1.3.3. Proof of Theorem 1.3.4. It turns out that Theorem 1.3.4 follows almost immediately from Theorem 1.3.3 by a straightforward generalization of an idea in [**BS87**].

LEMMA 1.3.5. *Let B be a fixed, connected graph, and let $r\geq 1$ be an integer. For any strictly non-backtracking closed walk, w, in B, we have that the expected number of closed walks over w in $G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ of order at least r bounded above by*

$$C\binom{k}{r+1}(2k)^{r+1}n^{-r}. \tag{1.14}$$

In particular, the expected number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks, w, in a graph, $G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, such that the Euler characteristic of $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ *is no more than $-r$ is bounded by*

$$C\binom{k}{r+1}(2k)^{r+1}n^{-r}\operatorname{Tr}(H_B^k) \tag{1.15}$$

provided that k/n is sufficiently small (i.e., less than a positive function of r and B), where C depends only on r and B; the above expression is bounded by

$$C'k^{2r+2}n^{-r}\operatorname{Tr}(H_B^k) \tag{1.16}$$

for some different constant, C', depending only on r and B.

PROOF. (Compare Lemma 3 of [**BS87**] and the proof of Theorem 2.18 in [**Fri91**].) For any $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, consider the unique word, w', over w, whose initial vertex is $v'_0 = (v_0, i_0)$,

$$w' = (v'_0, e'_1, v'_1, \ldots, v'_k).$$

Then w' must contain at least $r+1$ coincidences, where a *coincidence* is a value, i, with $1 \leq i \leq k$, where the the head of e'_i was already visited (as a v'_j with $j \leq i-1$), but the value of e'_i was not determined by previous edges (as an e'_j or its inverse, with $j \leq i-1$). Consider the position of the first $r+1$ coincidences, which can occur in $\binom{k}{r+1}$ ways. Let us fix these $r+1$ coincidence values, $j_1, \ldots, j_{r+1}$, with

$$1 \leq j_1 < \cdots j_{r+1} \leq k.$$

We may view the vertices

$$v'_j = (v_j, i_j)$$

in w' as arising from random variables $i_1, \ldots, i_k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, where we successively determine the value of i_1, then i_2, etc. Notice that at a coincidence, j (equal to one of the fixed values $j_1, \ldots, j_{r+1}$ above) we have that the value of i_j is a random variable that must take on one of the values $i_0, \ldots, i_{j-1}$, and yet the value of the edge over e_j with tail (v_{j-1}, i_{j-1}) has not been determined. So the probability that j is a coincidence, given $i_0, \ldots, i_{j-1}$, is at most $1/(n-j+1)$ (since at most $j-1$ values over e_j have been fixed via the $e'_1, \ldots, e'_{j-1}$). Hence the probability that i_j is a coincidence for $j = j_1, \ldots, j_{r+1}$ is at most

$$j/(n-j+1) \leq k/(n-k) \leq 2k/n$$

if $k \leq n/2$. Hence, for $k/n \leq 1/2$, the $r+1$ coincidences occur with probability at most

$$(2k/n)^{r+1}.$$

Since there are n possible choices for i_0, and the first $r+1$ coincidences occur in $\binom{k}{r+1}$ locations, we conclude the bound in (1.14). Hence the total number of expected closed walks of $r+1$ or more coincidences, i.e., of Euler characteristic $-r$ or smaller, is bounded by the expression in (1.14) times $\mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)$, the number of strictly closed non-backtracking walks of length k in B. This yields the bound involving (1.15). The statement with the bound (1.16) is an immediate consequence. □

The above lemma is another fundamental part of the method of [**BS87, Fri91, Fri03, Fri08**]. Applying this lemma for $r = 1$ shows that the expected number of strictly non-backtracking walks that are not loops is at most

$$O(k^4/n)\,\mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k),$$

and hence Theorem 1.3.4 follows from the above lemma and Theorem 1.3.3.

1.3.4. $1/n$-Asymptotic Expansions and B-Ramanujan Functions. To prove the Alon conjecture, we anticipate that Theorem 1.3.4 may be refined to give a "$1/n$-asymptotic expansion" as was done for regular graphs in [**Fri91, Fri08**]. From Proposition 2.3.8 and Lemma 1.3.5, it is not hard to see that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\Big]$$

has an asymptotic expansion of the form

$$P_0(k) + P_1(k)n^{-1} + \cdots + P_{r-1}(k)n^{1-r} + O(k^{r+1})n^{-r}\operatorname{Tr}(H_B^k),$$

where the $P_i(k)$ are some functions of k. The methods of [**Fri91**], show that for $B = W_{d/2}$ and small r, i.e., r satisfying (1.6), one has that each $P_i(k)$ has a "principle part," namely $(d-1)^k p_i(k)$ where $p_i(k)$ is a polynomial, and an "error term" of size bounded by $Ck^C(d-1)^{k/2}$. Furthermore, the principle part of $P_0(k)$ is $(d-1)^k$, and all other principle parts of the $P_i(k)$ vanish. Theorem 1.3.4 shows that for k even we have

$$P_0(k) = \operatorname{Tr}(H_B^k) + O(k)\operatorname{Tr}(H_B^{k/2}),$$

which for d-regular B means that

$$P_0(k) = \operatorname{Tr}(H_B^k) + O(k)(d-1)^{k/2}.$$

Hence, we may expect the principle part to involve powers of k in all the eigenvalues of H_B. Furthermore, as in [**Fri08**], we know that such a principle part plus error term will not hold when r is large, and in order to get an asymptotic expansion for all r (which seems needed to prove a relativized Alon conjecture via trace methods), we will need to modify the trace in a way that we omit graphs, G, with certain exceptional behaviour, i.e., avoiding tangles.

In anticipation of such expansions, we shall make some formal definitions.

Definition 1.3.6. Let $P = P(k)$ be a function from, $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, the non-negative integers, to itself. Let B be a graph. We say that P is a *B-Ramanujan function* if it can be written as

$$P(k) = s(k) + e(k), \tag{1.17}$$

where

(1) there are polynomials, $p_\mu(k)$, with μ ranging over all the eigenvalues of H_B, for which $s(k)$ is given by

$$s(k) = \sum_{\mu \in \operatorname{Spec}(H_B)} \mu^k p_\mu(k);$$

$s(k)$ is called the *principle part* of the decomposition of $P(k)$ as in (1.17); and

(2) we have that $e(k)$, called the *error term* in (1.17) is such that for every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a $C > 0$ for which

$$|e(k)| \leq C\Big(\operatorname{Spec}(H_B) + \epsilon\Big)^{k/2}. \tag{1.18}$$

It is easy to see that the $p_\mu(k)$ in the principle part are uniquely determined (i.e., independent of the decomposition in (1.17)) for μ such that

$$|\mu| > \Big(\operatorname{Spec}(H_B)\Big)^{1/2},$$

and otherwise $p_\mu(k)$ are arbitrary (each choice of which affects the error term $e(k)$). We remark that we could replace C by Ck^C and get the same definition, since for large k we can dominate the k^C contribution by replacing ϵ with any $\epsilon' > \epsilon$.

The two basic examples of B-Ramanujan functions are as follows:

(1) for arbitrary base graph B which is connected and of negative Euler characteristic, Theorem 1.3.4 shows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\Big] = P_0(k) + O(k^4/n)\,\mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k), \tag{1.19}$$

where $P_0(k)$ is B-Ramanujan, and

(2) for $B = W_{d/2}$ and d even, the methods of [**BS87**] and [**Fri91**] show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(W_{d/2})}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\Big] = P_0(k)+P_1(k)n^{-1}+\cdots+P_{r-1}(k)n^{1-r}+O(k^C)n^{-r}(d-1)^k \tag{1.20}$$

for certain values of r (Broder and Shamir show this for $r = 1$, and Friedman obtains this for any r satisfying (1.6)); we remark that the eigenvalues of H_B for $B = W_{d/2}$ are $d-1$, 1, and -1.

Definition 1.3.7. Let $f(k,n)$ be a function taking two positive integers, k and n, with values in the non-negative integers. Let r be a positive integer. We say that f has a $1/n$-*asymptotic expansion of order* r if there is an $\alpha = \alpha(r) > 0$ and a $C = C(r)$ such that for all k, n we have

$$f(k,n) = P_0(k) + P_1(k)n^{-1} + \cdots + P_{r-1}(k)n^{1-r} + \mathrm{err}(k,n), \tag{1.21}$$

for some functions $P_i = P_i(k)$, where for all k, n such that $1 \le k \le \alpha n^\alpha$ we have

$$|\mathrm{err}(k,n)| \le Ck^C\rho_H^k(B)n^{-r}, \tag{1.22}$$

where $\rho^k(H_B)$ is shorthand for $(\rho(H_B))^k$. Moreover, we say that the asymptotic expansion satisfies the *usual error bound* if $\mathrm{err}(k,n)$ satisfies the bound

$$|\mathrm{err}(k,n)| \le Ck^{2r+2}\Big(\rho_H(B)\Big)^k n^{-r}, \tag{1.23}$$

i.e., the error bound (1.22) with k^C replaced with k^{2r+2}. We call the $P_i(k)$ the *degree i coefficient* of the asymptotic expansion. We say that the expansion *is B-Ramanujan* or *has B-Ramanujan coefficients* if its coefficients—i.e., the $P_i(k)$—are B-Ramanujan functions.

We remark that the methods of [**Fri91**] show that a function such as

$$f(k,n) = \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\Big]$$

has an $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to all orders; however, this fact does not seem useful, unless we can assert something about the coefficients, $P_i(k)$, of the expansion.

Note that (1.19) and (1.20) are examples of $1/n$-asymptotic expansions with

$$f(k,n) = \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\Big]$$

for various B. The method of Theorem 2.12 of [**Fri08**] shows that for any even integer $d \ge 4$, the above expected trace with $B = W_{d/2}$ fails to have B-Ramanujan coefficients for r of size proportional to $d^{1/2}\log d$; actually this is done in [**Fri08**] for the expected number of closed, non-backtracking walks of length k for a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(W_{d/2})$, but it is easy to modify the argument there to apply to strictly non-backtracking closed walks, which is just the above expected trace of H_G^k.

In [**Fri08**], where $B = W_{d/2}$, one obtained $1/n$-asymptotic expansions with B-Ramanujan coefficients for arbitrarily large r by considering a different $f(k,n)$, namely the *selective trace* used there; roughly speaking, the selective trace of length

k in a graph, G, equals the number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks of length k such that no "long subwalks" of the walk trace out a subgraph that contains a tangle (as in Definition 1.2.4). Although the formal definition of a selective trace is rather cumbersome, the main point is that if G has no tangles—which is usually the case—then the selective trace of length k equals $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$; when G has one or more tangles, the selective trace is generally smaller than $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$. Selective traces enables one to get $1/n$-asymptotic expansions to arbitrary order, as in [**Fri08**], albeit for the expected value of a variant of $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$. In this paper we make a significant simplification over [**Fri08**] by replacing the selective traces by a more direct notion of a *certified trace*. We formally define the *certified trace* in the next section. For the rest of this section we explain a bit more on the trace method, which will help explain why the certified trace is a simpler variant of the selective trace, and yet ultimately gives bounds for the expected values of $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$ for graphs without tangles.

1.3.5. Types and Finite Linear Combinations of $1/n$-Asymptotic Expansions. In this paper, like in [**Fri91, Fri08**], we proceed in two steps. First, we show that certain modifications of the function

$$f(k,n) = \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\Big]$$

have $1/n$-asymptotic expansions to arbitrary large order. In this first part we know little about the principle parts of the coefficients of the expansion, i.e., the $P_i(k)$ of (1.21) in Definition 1.3.7. The second step seeks to use the existence of an expansion with coefficients $P_i(k)$ being B-Ramanujan to draw conclusions about "high probability" bounds on the eigenvalues of H_G or A_G for a random $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$.

A theme throughout [**Fri91, Fri08**] and this paper is that any finite linear combination of $1/n$-asymptotic expansions is, again, a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion. This is not generally true of infinite sums or infinite linear combinations. Hence if $f(k,n)$ is any variant of

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\Big],$$

it suffices to write the above, or a variant thereof, as a finite sum of $1/n$-asymptotic expansions.

The most basic observation about this process is that, by the proof of Lemma 1.3.5, to obtain a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r of the number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks of length k, or a subset of such walks, it suffices to count only those walks, w, such that $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ has Euler characteristic at least $1-r$. Hence, for example, it suffices that for each $i = 0, 1, \ldots, r-1$, the number of such walks with $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ of Euler characteristic exactly $-i$ has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion. Furthermore, as already evident in [**BS87**], one can often analyze this number, for a given i, in terms to certain essential features of w and $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$, such as the starting vertex of w and all vertices in $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ of degree at least three.

Indeed, for $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ of Euler characteristic zero, Broder and Shamir reduce such walks into two cases: (1) those where $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ is a simple cycle, and (2) those where $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ is a cycle plus a path, where the starting vertex is of degree 1 and one other vertex is of degree three. Case (2) can only yield closed, non-backtracking walks that are not strictly non-backtracking, since each vertex of $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ must be of degree at least two if w is a strictly non-backtracking closed walk.

Similarly, it is well known (see [**LP10**]) that all graphs, G', of Euler characteristic -1 occurring as the graph of a strictly non-backtracking closed walk can be viewed as three cases: (1) a "figure 8" graph (where one vertex is of degree four), (2) a "barbell" graph (where two vertices are of degree three, with only one path connecting the two vertices), and (3) a "theta" graph (i.e., looks like a θ), with two vertices of degree three jointed by three edge disjoint paths. The fact that

$$2\chi(G') = \sum_{v \in V_{G'}} \Big(2 - \text{degree}_{G'}(v)\Big)$$

shows that the above are the only three shapes of a connected graph, G', each of whose vertices have degree at least two.

Similarly, the "shape" of any graph of fixed Euler characteristic arising as $G' = \text{Graph}(w)$ for a strictly non-backtracking closed walk can be divided into a finite number of "shapes," according to the starting vertex of the walk, all vertices of G' of degree greater than three, and how these vertices are connected by edge disjoint paths in G'. The *type* of a walk, w, remembers this information as some other finite amount of information, such as in which order the vertices and paths are visited; see Subsection 2.3.4 of this article, or similar definitions in [**Fri91, Fri08**]. The key point is each $1/n$-asymptotic expansions to order r that we study involves summing over a finite number of possible Euler characteristics, each sum subdivided into a finite number of "types."

The sum of walks of a given type will be further subdivided into a linear combination of simpler sums. Our "certified trace" makes this subdivision very simple.

1.4. Certified Traces

In this section we will define the the certified trace and explain in rough terms its significant features; its full significance may not be evident until Chapter 2. The main feature, like the notion of the *type* of a walk, is to divide a complicated sum into a *finite* linear combination of simpler sums.

1.4.1. The Certified Trace. The following is a self-contained definition of the certified traces that we will use in Chapter 2 (see Definition 2.4.27).

Definition 1.4.1. For any graph, G, we define its *r-th truncated certified trace of length k*, denoted

$$\text{CertTr}_{<r}(G, k)$$

to be the number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks, w, in G, of length k, such that $\text{Graph}(w)$ is of order less than r and is not a B-tangle.

As explained in Subsection 1.3.5, we will classify all walks, w, for which $\text{Graph}(w)$ has a given Euler characteristic into its *type*, which involves various data about w; this will include the *type graph* $T = \text{TypeGraph}(w)$, where V_T consists of the first vertex of w and all vertices of degree three or more, and where E_T has an edge for each path in $\text{Graph}(w)$ joining two vertices of V_T.

Let us work backwards: given the graph T as above, a walk, w, for which $\text{TypeGraph}(w) = T$ is counted in $\text{CertTr}_{<r}(G, k)$ iff

(1) $\text{ord}(T) < r$, since we easily verify that T and $\text{Graph}(w)$ have the same Euler characteristic; and

(2) if each $e \in E_T$ corresponds to a path of length $k(e)$ in w, then the collection $\vec{k} = \{k(e)\}_{e \in E_T}$, satisfies

$$\rho_H\Big(\mathrm{VLG}(T, \vec{k})\Big) < \sqrt{\rho_H(G)}.$$

We are therefore lead to consider

$$S(T) = \Big\{\vec{k} \colon E_T \to \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid \rho_H\Big(\mathrm{VLG}(T, \vec{k})\Big) < \sqrt{\rho_H(G)}\Big\}, \tag{1.24}$$

which is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For each $\vec{k} \in S(T)$, we will consider various functions, $f(\vec{k})$, and we will want to conclude that sums of the form

$$\sum_{\vec{k} \in S(T)} f(\vec{k}) \tag{1.25}$$

which give the coefficients of $1/n$-asymptotic expansions, are B-Ramanujan functions.

We shall explain that although $S(T)$ my have a complicated structure, an abstract sum as in (1.25) can be written as a finite linear combination of simpler sums, provided that $S(T)$ has a finite number of *minimal elements*. The rest of this section is a discussion of this point.

1.4.2. Minimal Elements in Posets. At this point we will summarize the discussion in Subsection 2.4.3, to explain why the certified trace is useful. This discussion applies to a variety of posets, i.e., partially ordered sets, P, but we shall only be concerned with the case $P = \mathbb{Z}^m_{>0}$, for various values of m, which becomes a poset under the partial order on two elements

$$\vec{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_m), \quad \vec{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$$

of $\mathbb{Z}^m_{>0}$ given as

$$\vec{x} \leq \vec{y} \quad \text{iff} \quad x_i \leq y_i \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m.$$

Let P be a poset on a countable number of elements, and assume (1) that the supremum (i.e., least upper bound, i.e., join) of any two elements exists in P, and (2) any *upper set* $S \subset P$, i.e., $s \in S$ and $s \leq s'$ implies $s' \in S$, has a finite number of minimal elements. Then inclusions/exclusion shows that any absolutely convergent sum

$$\sum_{s \in S} f(s) \tag{1.26}$$

for $f \colon S \to \mathbb{R}$, may be written as a linear combination of a finite number of sums

$$\mathrm{Sum}(s_0, f) = \sum_{s_0 \leq s} f(s). \tag{1.27}$$

It turns out that it (1.27) will be much easier to analyze that (1.26), and it will be crucial to know that the upper sets, S, of interest to us have a finite number of minimal elements.

In a bit more detail, in our situation $f(s) = f(s, k)$ will depend on an element, $s \in S$, and a positive integer k. It follows that if each sum in (1.27), with $f(s)$ replaced with $f(s, k)$, is B-Ramanujan as a function of k, then so is the sum in (1.26) with $f = f(s, k)$. Again, the sums in (1.27) will be much easier to analyze than those in (1.26), with $f = f(s, k)$.

The essential fact that we will show in Subsection 2.4.3 is that *any* upper set in $\mathbb{Z}^m_{>0}$ has a finite number of minimal elements. This is easy to deduce from the well-known fact that if $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ are independent transcendentals over the complex numbers, $\mathbb{C}$, then any ideal in $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ is finitely generated.

We remark that [**Fri08**] works with sets like

$$\left\{\vec{k}\colon E_T \to \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \mid g(\vec{k}) \leq \alpha\right\}, \tag{1.28}$$

for various functions $g(\vec{k})$ and real numbers α; there a sort of "compactness" argument shows that such sets have a finite number of minimal elements (see, for example, Lemma 9.2 of [**Fri08**]). However the strict inequality in (1.24) means such compactness don't generally work.

We remark that in $\mathbb{Z}^2_{>0}$, the upper set of pairs (k_1, k_2) for which $k_1 + k_2 > 1000$ has 1000 minimal elements; replacing 1000 with any positive integer we see that number of minimal elements an upper set of $\mathbb{Z}^2_{>0}$ (and similarly with 2 replaced by with any $m \geq 2$) can have an arbitrarily large number of minimal elements.

1.5. Other New Ideas in This Article

In this section, we briefly explain two other new techniques we use in this article, beyond the methods of [**Fri08**]. These are (1) a generalized side-stepping lemma, needed when B is d-regular but not Ramanujan, and (2) estimates involving "larger edge multiplicities."

1.5.1. A More General "side-stepping lemma". Let us review the "side-stepping lemma" and its use in [**Fri08**], and indicate our more general lemma.

Using the certified trace we will show that for any B and positive integer, r,

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\Big]$$

has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r with respect to B. It is conceivable that this alone may allow us to deduce the generalized Alon conjecture with base B; but this is not so clear.

Following [**Fri08**] we use the following idea, which requires some notion.

NOTATION 1.5.1. Let $\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$ denote the set of graphs that contain a B-tangle of order less than r, and let $\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}}$ denote the indicator function of $\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$. Let $\mathrm{TF}_{r,B}$ is the complement of $\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$, i.e., those graphs free of B-tangles of order less than r, and denote the indicator function of $\mathrm{TF}_{r,B}$

$$\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G) = 1 - \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}}(G).$$

It is not hard to adapt the techniques used to obtain the above $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}}(G)\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\Big]$$

has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r with respect to B. It then follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\Big]$$

also has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r with respect to B. However, when G is free of tangles of order less than r, then

$$\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)$$

is the sum of all strictly non-backtracking closed walks of length k and order less than r, and it follows—essentially from Lemma 1.3.5—that therefore

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\right]$$

has the same $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r, modulo the error term, as

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\right].$$

At this point we wish to use the fact that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\right] \tag{1.29}$$

has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r to draw conclusions about a high probability bound regarding the eigenvalues of H_G for $G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. For reasons similar to those mentioned in Subsection 1.2.4, we do not expect good results by applying the asymptotic expansion to one value of k for a given n. Rather, for each n we use the existence of the expansion for many values of k to draw some conclusions about the typical locations of eigenvalues of H_G; this is because we have no a priori information about the principle parts of the coefficients in the expansion. This is called "side-stepping," i.e., side-stepping the fact that we have no information on the principle parts.

The basic idea of the "side-stepping" lemma of [**Fri08**] is that each coefficient has a principle part that is a polynomial in k times $(d-1)^k$ (in this case $B=W_{d/2}$ has eigenvalues $d-1$, -1, and 1); hence by applying a sufficiently high power of $S-(d-1)$, where S is the "shift operator in k" (i.e., $(Sf)(k,n)=f(k+1,n)$), we annihilate the principle part of each coefficient. The "side-stepping" lemma here is a little more involved (and gives a less information), because if B is not Ramanujan, then the principle part of the coefficients can contain terms which are polynomials in k times μ^k for possibly a number of eigenvalues, μ, of H_B, that are greater than $(\rho_H(B))^{1/2}$; this contrasts with the case of $\mu=\pm(d-1)$, where, in Section 3.3, we use *spreading*—a type of expansion (see Section 3.2)—in random covers, to control the contribution of the $\mu=\pm(d-1)$ principle parts. Such a side-stepping is technically more complicated, but very much in the spirit of the original side-stepping lemma.

The side-stepping lemmas, both here and in [**Fri08**], show that any non-zero principle part of a coefficient in the order r $1/n$-asymptotic expansion of the expected value in (1.29) actually arises from eigenvalues of H_G that are concentrated near an H_B eigenvalue (larger than $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$) with probability proportional to n^{-i}, for some $i<r$. We can use this fact in two ways, for the two main theorems of this paper: (1) for Theorem 0.1.1, which follows from Theorem 0.2.6, the smallest possible value of i is one, due to the fact that the first term of the $1/n$-asymptotic expansion, i.e., the n^0 term, exactly matches the old eigenvalues of H_G, i.e., those of H_B, as Theorem 1.3.4 shows; and (2) for Theorem 0.1.3, in this case $\pm(d-1)$ are the only possible eigenvalues of H_B greater than $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$, and in this case any concentration of eigenvalues near $d-1$ can be attributed to G being nearly disconnected, and this can be controlled by the aforementioned *spreading* probabilities estimated in Section 3.2.

We remark that we will apply our side-stepping lemma to (1.29), and this equation makes no reference to the certified trace; this is similar to [**Fri08**], where the selective trace is used to obtain $1/n$-asymptotic expansions, but does not appear

once the side-stepping lemma there is applied. The point is we need some *modified trace*, like the certified or selective trace, to control the coefficients of the $1/n$-asymptotic expansions we use. Both here and in [**Fri08**], we use modified traces which equal $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$ for most $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$. Then, once we control the expansions for the expected value of a modified trace, and for the same multiplied by $\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{HasTangle}_{<r,B}}$, then we have essentially controlled the expansions for the expected value of the tangle free indicator, $\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}$, times the Hashimoto trace $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$.

We remark that it is conceivable that one could construct a more direct argument regarding the relativized Alon conjecture using only the expected certified trace $1/n$-asymptotic expansions, without invoking estimates with the above indicator functions. At present we do not know how to do this.

1.5.2. The Second Idea: Weaker B-Ramanujan Functions, Simpler Estimates. The second idea is a bit technical, and will only become clear in the proof of Lemma 2.4.32. However we can give the rough idea.

In [**Fri91, Fri08**], Friedman defined B-Ramanujan functions, with B having one vertex and being d regular, but we require the error term to be bounded by

$$Ck^C(d-1)^{k/2}.$$

Notice that for B begin d-regular, our definition amounts to a bound, for any positive ϵ, of

$$C(d-1+\epsilon)^{k/2},$$

with $C = C(\epsilon)$. Hence our notion is a bit weaker, but we observe in this paper that this weaker error term bound suffices to prove the Alon conjecture or its relativization, such as Theorems 0.1.1 and 0.1.3. The first error term estimate, used in [**Fri91, Fri08**], is much more difficult to obtain on the coefficients of $1/n$-asymptotic expansions.

To elaborate, [**Fri08**] proves the $1/n$-asymptotic coefficients of the selective traces are B-Ramanujan by using estimates on two functions there, namely W in Theorem 6.6, and $f_{\vec{m}}$, in Theorem 8.5, which are multiplied together. We point out a minor error there, namely that Theorem 6.6 is incorrect unless we replace M_2 there with the quantity j_2 as in the proof of Theorem 8.5; however, to balance this, we note that Theorem 8.5 can easily be improved to have M_2 replaced with j_2, as well; hence the fact that the coefficients are B-Ramanujan still holds. But the point is that any increase in an upper bound for W must be compensated by a sharper bound for $f_{\vec{m}}$.

In this article, the roles played by W, and $f_{\vec{m}}$ in [**Fri08**] are played by our $Q_1(K_1;\vec{m}^1)$ and $Q_2(K_2)$ (the $Q_2(K_2)$ incorporates the W into it). The precise definitions and estimates are given in Subsection 2.4.5. However, roughly speaking, the reason our estimates are much simpler is due to the fact that it suffices to show that

$$|Q_2(K_2)| \leq \big(\rho(H_B)+\varepsilon\big)^{K_2/2}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and K_2 sufficiently large, rather than to give a more precise $CK_2^C(\rho(H_B))^{K_2/2}$ estimate (possibly with some factors that trade off between $Q_2(K_2)$ and $Q_1(K_1;\vec{m}^1)$, as needed in [**Fri08**] between W and $f_{\vec{m}}$). And the reason this weaker estimate on $Q_2(K_2)$ suffices is due to our weaker notion of B-Ramanujan.

CHAPTER 2

The d-Regular Case Without Half-Loops

The point of this chapter is to prove the relativized Alon conjecture in the case where the base graph, B, is d-regular, for the Broder-Shamir model of a random cover of degree n of B. In addition, it will ease notation to assume that B has no half-loops (although this does not change the main techniques in any essential way). So in this section we prove Theorem 0.1.1, allowing B to be any d-regular graph, with multiple edges and whole-loops allowed, but without half-loops. The case of allowing B to have half-loops or more general "algebraic models" will be discussed in Section 3.4.

2.1. Introduction and Overview of This Chapter

We begin by giving an overview of this chapter; throughout we will assume that the base graph, B, is a d-regular, connected graph, for some integer $d \geq 3$, and that B does not have half-loops. For as long as possible, we will discuss theorems for arbitrary connected graphs, B, of negative Euler characteristic without half-loops. In fact, we will prove Theorem 0.2.6 for all such B. Theorem 0.1.1 follows almost immediately. We note that the Broder-Shamir model $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, and all our results, require extra care when B has half-loops; the discussion of Theorem 0.2.6 for B with half-loops will be addressed in Chapter 3, specifically Section 3.4.

Most of the work in this chapter is devoted to establishing a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion for

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\, \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\,\right]$$

i.e., the expected value of $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$, where we replace the trace by zero when G contains an element of $\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}$—i.e., a B-tangle of order less than r—as a subgraph (recall Notation 1.5.1). Let us state the result formally.

THEOREM 2.1.1. *Let B be any connected graph of positive order without half-loops. Then for any positive integer, r,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)] \tag{2.1}$$

has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r, satisfying the usual error bound, (1.23), in the sense of Definition 1.3.7, whose coefficients are B-Ramanujan functions.

We will show that the event $\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$ has probability proportional to n^{-j} in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for some $j \geq 1$ and all $j > r$. It follows that that $P_0(k)$ in the above theorem is the same as the $P_0(k)$ computed in Section 1.3. The same observation about $\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$ in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ implies that the $P_i(k)$ cannot have vanishing principle part for all values of i; this means that we cannot use Theorem 2.1.1 alone to derive conclusions about the relativized Alon Conjecture.

It is conceivable that the the expected value in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ of $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$ conditioned on $G \in \mathrm{TF}(r,B)$ has an $1/n$-asymptotic expansion whose coefficients have vanishing

principle part. This would allow us to conclude the relativized Alon Conjecture more simply. However, our methods do not give explicit values of the coefficients in the $1/n$-asymptotic expansion; hence in this paper, as well as [**Fri08**], we need a sort of *side-stepping lemma* alluded to in Subsection 1.5.1 in conjuction with the above theorem.

After proving Theorem 2.1.1, and developing appropriate *side-stepping* machinery, the relativized Alon Conjecture, for regular base graphs without half-loops, will follow quite easily.

Let us give an overview of this chapter, including the proof of Theorem 2.1.1. In Sections 2.2—2.4 we establish the most technically difficult theorem below.

THEOREM 2.1.2. *Let B be any connected graph of positive order without half-loops. Then for any positive integer, r,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\ \mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\ ] \tag{2.2}$$

has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r, satisfying the usual error bound, (1.23), in the sense of Definition 1.3.7, whose coefficients are B-Ramanujan functions.

In Section 2.2 we will give a number of preliminary and general facts regarding graphs and convolution of functions. In Section 2.3 we will develop a theory of walk sums, in the spirit of [**Fri08**], which will be the starting point for all of our $1/n$-asymptotic expansions. Section 2.4 develops some technical estimates regarding tangles and certified traces that allow us to prove Theorem 2.1.2.

Section 2.5 will generalize the discussion in Sections 2.3 and Section 2.4—in the spirit of Chapter 9 of [**Fri08**]—to give theorems that are variants of Theorem 2.1.2, including the following theorem.

THEOREM 2.1.3. *Let B be any connected graph of positive order without half-loops. Then for any positive integer, r,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\ \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}}(G)\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\ \Big] \tag{2.3}$$

has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r, with B-Ramanujan coefficients, satisfying the usual error bound. Hence (subtracting (2.3) from (2.2)) the same is true for

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\ \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\ ] \tag{2.4}$$

We finish Section 2.5 by remarking that Theorems 2.1.2, 2.1.3, and 2.3.13 easily yield Theorem 2.1.1.

From here Section 2.6 gives the *side-stepping* machinery needed here. At this point all the discussion is valid for an arbitrary graph, B, of positive order and without half-loops. It is only in Section 2.7 that we specialize to the case of d-regular B, in which we prove the relativized Alon conjecture, Theorem 0.1.1 (assuming B has no half-loops). The case where B is regular but may have half-loops is addressed in Section 3.4.

For the rest of this section we wish to give an overview of the ideas of Sections 2.3 and 2.4, because they involve some rather technical discussion and estimates, although their underlying ideas are fairly simple. This will be done in the next subsection.

2.1.1. More on Types and Asymptotic Expansions. The basic idea of Broder and Shamir [**BS87**] and Friedman [**Fri91, Fri03, Fri08**] is to organize the walks, w, by their type graph, i.e., the graph T associated to w by setting V_T to be the initial vertex of w and all vertices of Graph(w) of degree at least 3; assuming w is strictly non-backtracking, all vertices of Graph(w) have degree at least 2, and the vertices not in V_T can be contracted to get a graph T whose vertices are V_T and whose edges represent beaded paths (whose interior vertices are all of degree two) in Graph(w). There is some additional data that the *type* remembers, which we now describe. A more formal description—in the context of *walk sums*—will be given in Section 2.3.

Before doing so, we emphasize that the notion of type would be much harder to use if we allowed w to backtrack: if w is non-backtracking, then at any point that w enters the first edge in a beaded path, it must continue along such a path until it reaches the end. This greatly simplifies matters: it means that each edge in a beaded path is traversed the same number of times, and the number of closed, non-backtracking walks in Graph(w) of length k can be deduced from the graph, T, and knowing what is the length of each beaded path in Graph(w) corresponding to each edge of T.

For a walk, w, in G, we remember some additional data beyond the graph, T, obtained by collapsing the degree two paths in Graph(w); namely we remember

(1) the vertices of B lying below (i.e., via the projection $\pi\colon G \to B$ restricted to Graph(w) $\subset G$) the vertices of Graph(w) that we remember in T (i.e., the vertices of T, which are the initial vertex and all vertices of degree at least three),
(2) a lettering, meaning, for each edge incident to a vertex of T in Graph(w), we remember to which edge in B it is mapped, and
(3) the order in which all type edges and vertices are first encountered in w (so the edges and vertices of T are ordered sets), and the direction in which each edge is first traversed.

We call this data the *type* of w, denoting it $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(w)$, which consists of an underlying graph, T, along with the B structure of the 1-neighbourhood of all T vertices in w, and the ordering of the vertices and edges of T, and orientation of edges.

Our main approach works with a certain type of function and various convolutions of such functions which we now define.

Definition 2.1.4. Let C be a finite set of complex numbers. We say that a function, $P = P(\vec{k})$ from $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1})^m$ to the integers is *polyexponential with bases* C if P is given as

$$P(\vec{k}) = \sum_{\vec{c}=(c_1,\ldots,c_m)\in C^m} p_{\vec{c}}(\vec{k})\vec{c}^{\vec{k}},$$

where $p_{\vec{c}}(\vec{k})$ is a polynomial in $\vec{k}$, and we use the shorthand

$$\vec{c}^{\vec{k}} = c_1^{k_1}\ldots c_m^{k_m}.$$

If B is a graph, then by a *B-polyexponential* we mean a polyexponential with bases being the spectrum of H_B.

It turns out that, as a fairly straightforward extension of the ideas of [**Fri91**], we have that the $P_i(k)$ of (2.1) are linear combinations of sums of the form:

$$\sum_{\vec{m}\cdot\vec{k}=k} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})P(\vec{k}), \tag{2.5}$$

where

(1)
$$\vec{m},\vec{k}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T},$$
i.e., $\vec{m},\vec{k}$ are vectors indexed over E_T of positive integers; here $\vec{m}$ tells us how many times each edge in T is traversed, and $\vec{k}$ tells us the length of each beaded path corresponding to each edge of T;

(2) $P(\vec{k})$ is given by polyexponential in bases $\mathrm{Spec}(H_B)$, where $\vec{k}$ is a vector indexed over E_T; and

(3) $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})$ counts the number of walks in T that correspond to walks contributing to strictly non-backtracking closed walks of length k, where edge $f\in E_T$ corresponds to a path of length k_f in $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ and m_f is the number of times $f\in E_T$ is traversed (in either direction). Of course, here $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})$ is independent of $\vec{k}$.

The problem with (2.5) is that the function $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})$ is often so large that the sum in (2.5) is not a B-Ramanujan function (or if it is, it is difficult to prove this). In fact, as previously mentioned, for some i of size at most roughly $d^{1/2}\log d$, the expected value of $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$ has an asymptotic expansion whose i-th coefficient fails to be a B-Ramanujan function for $B=W_{d/2}$ (see [**Fri08**]).

To remedy this, we note that (2.1) can be generalized to

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathcal{W}_n(G,k)] = P_0^{\mathcal{W}}(k)+P_1^{\mathcal{W}}(k)n^{-1}+\cdots+P_{r-1}^{\mathcal{W}}(k)n^{1-r}+\mathrm{err}_r(n,k) \tag{2.6}$$

where $\mathcal{W}(G,k)$ counts strictly non-backtracking closed walks subject to certain restrictions—where the restrictions (left vague for now) are formalized as *walk sums* in [**Fri08**] and in Section 2.3 of this article—and where $P_i^{\mathcal{W}}(k)$ are functions given by linear combinations of sums similar to (2.5), namely

$$\sum_{\vec{m}\cdot\vec{k}=k} W_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{W}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})P(\vec{k}), \tag{2.7}$$

with $P(\vec{k})$ are before, but now $W_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{W}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})$ counts walks in T, the underlying graph of $\mathcal{T}$, corresponding to strictly non-backtracking closed walks with the restrictions of $\mathcal{W}$.

The idea is that if $\mathcal{W}$ counts only the strictly closed, non-backtracking walks, w, such that don't trace out a tangle, then $W_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{W}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})$ should be small enough so that (2.7) converges to a B-Ramanujan function. In [**Fri08**] this was achieved with $\mathcal{W}$ being a *selective trace*, which is a fairly technical concept; in this paper we instead use a certified trace, in the sense of Definition 1.4.1. We remark that $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ and its associated type, $\mathcal{T}$, with underlying graph T, have the same Euler characteristic, i.e.,

$$\chi(\mathrm{Graph}(w)) = \chi(\mathcal{T}).$$

It follows that the $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ which are counted, and hence then number of w counted, can be expressed purely in terms of T and the path lengths, $\vec{k}\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$, i.e.,

$$-\chi(T)<r, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{VLG}(T,\vec{k})<\rho^{1/2}(H_B) \tag{2.8}$$

Hence we restrict the sum

$$\sum_{\vec{m}\cdot\vec{k}=k} W_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{W}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})P(\vec{k})$$

to those $\mathcal{T}$ whose graph T and whose $\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$ satisfy (2.8), and $W_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{W}}(\vec{m},\vec{k})$ is simply the original $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m})$. This gives us the certified trace of Definition 1.4.1. One crucial aspect of the certified trace, like other simplifications such as types, is that it leads to writing the coefficients, $P_i^{\mathcal{W}}(k)$, of the $1/n$-asymptotic expansion of the certified trace in terms of a finite number of simpler terms, as described in Section 1.4.

This certified trace can be seen to be a good approximation to $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$, for graphs, G, that do not contain tangles from $\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$ as subgraphs. Unfortunately, this sum seems unpredictable if G does contain such a tangle. As a remedy, one can see that if we form the same sum, but this time insist that G contains a tangle, we also get terms analogous to (2.7) that converge to B-Ramanujan functions. Subtracting the two sums, as explained in Subsection 1.5.1, we get a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r with B-Ramanujan coefficients for

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)] - \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{HasTangle}_{B,r}[n]}\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)]$$
$$= \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}_{B,r}[n]}\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)],$$

which is, within an error term described by Lemma 1.3.5, of

$$= \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}_{B,r}[n]}\,\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)].$$

This will prove Theorem 2.1.1, and, with the appropriate side-stepping lemmas, yields Theorem 0.2.6 and, as an easy consequence, the relativized Alon conjecture for d-regular B without half-loops.

2.2. Preliminaries

In this section we give various preliminary definitions and technical lemmas that will be used to prove the main theorems of this paper.

2.2.1. The Order of a Graph and Pruned Graphs. Recall, from Definition 1.2.3, that the order of a graph, G, is just

$$\mathrm{ord}(G) = -\chi(G) = |E_G| - |V_G|.$$

Theorem 2.4.7 will show that the expected number of occurrences (see Definition 2.4.5) of ψ in a graph in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is roughly $n^{-\mathrm{ord}(\psi)}$. To prove this theorem we shall need some basic facts about the order.

Definition 2.2.1. We say that a graph is a *tree* if it is connected and of Euler characteristic -1. We say that a graph is *treeless* if none of its connected components is a tree. We say that a graph is *pruned* if all of its vertices have degree at least two.

The term *pruned* will be explained in more detail in Subsection 2.4.2. Our definition of a pruned graph is like the usual notion of pruning, except that we do not allow isolated vertices in the graph. Our interested in the above notion of "pruned" is that we will need some theorems, given in this subsection, that are not true for general graphs; we will apply such theorems to graphs that are the union of graphs of non-backtracking walks, and such unions are pruned. We remark

that historically, pruning, or "shaving off trees" (see [**Sta83**]), is a procedure of interest in various parts of graph theory, even including trace methods and the Alon conjecture [**BS87, Fri91**], used to "reduce" a general closed walk, w, in a graph to a non-backtracking walk in the graph.

PROPOSITION 2.2.2. *For any graph without half-loops we have*

$$\operatorname{ord}(\psi) = \sum_{v \in V_\psi} \big(\deg_\psi(v) - 2\big)/2. \tag{2.9}$$

In particular, if ψ is pruned, then it is treeless.

PROOF. the first statement follows from the fact that $\operatorname{ord}(\psi) = |E_\psi| - |V_\psi|$ and that each edge contributes twice to the sum of all vertex degrees. The second statement by applying (2.9) to any connected component of a pruned graph, i.e., a graph all of whose vertices are of degree at least two. □

THEOREM 2.2.3. *Let ψ_1 be a subgraph of a pruned graph, ψ_2. Then the order of ψ_1 is at most that of ψ_2.*

PROOF. We have

$$\operatorname{ord}(\psi_2) = \sum_{v \in V_{\psi_2}} \big(\deg_{\psi_2}(v) - 2\big)/2 \geq \sum_{v \in V_{\psi_1}} \big(\deg_{\psi_2}(v) - 2\big)/2$$

since each $v \in V_{\psi_2}$ has degree at least two. For any $v \in V_{\psi_1}$ we have that its degree in ψ_1 is at most its degree in ψ_2, and hence

$$\operatorname{ord}(\psi_2) \geq \sum_{v \in V_{\psi_1}} \big(\deg_{\psi_2}(v) - 2\big)/2 \tag{2.10}$$

$$\geq \sum_{v \in V_{\psi_1}} \big(\deg_{\psi_1}(v) - 2\big)/2 = \operatorname{ord} \psi_1. \tag{2.11}$$

□

THEOREM 2.2.4. *Let ψ_1 be a proper subgraph of a pruned graph, ψ_2. Assume that each connected component of ψ_2 has positive order. Then the order of ψ_1 is strictly less than that of ψ_2.*

PROOF. It suffices to show that when each connected component of ψ_2 has positive Euler characteristic, then in the proof of the previous theorem at least one of (2.10) and (2.11) is a strict inequality.

Assume that some connected component, ψ_2', of ψ_2 contains no vertex of ψ_1. Then (2.10) is strict, since the sum over ψ_1 vertices completely misses all the ψ_2' vertices, and the sum over ψ_2' vertices is at least one.

If the assumption of the last paragraph is false, then each connected component of ψ_2 contains at least one vertex of ψ_1. Since ψ_1 is a proper subgraph of ψ_2, there is at least one edge, e, of ψ_2 that does not lie in ψ_1, and there is at least one vertex, v, in that connected component of ψ_2 that also lies in ψ_1. Take a path connecting e to v in ψ_2; along this path there must be an edge, e', which doesn't lie in ψ_1, such that e' is incident upon a vertex, v', that lies in ψ_1. For this vertex, $v' \in V_{\psi_1}$, we have

$$\deg_{\psi_1}(v') < \deg_{\psi_2}(v'),$$

and hence (2.11) is a strict inequality.

Hence at least one of the inequalities in (2.10) and (2.11) is strict. □

2.2.2. Convolutions. In computing the coefficients of various asymptotic expansions, we will need some facts about the convolutions of functions on the positive integers. It is slightly more convenient to work with convolutions on the non-negative integers; however, as we show below (see the remark just after Definition 2.2.12), this makes little difference.

DEFINITION 2.2.5. Let g_1 and g_2 be two functions defined on the non-negative integers. We define their *convolution*, $g_1 * g_2$, to be the function on non-negative integers given by

$$(g_1 * g_2)(k) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} g_1(j)g_2(k-j)$$

for any $k \geq 0$.

First, we make the following observation.

THEOREM 2.2.6. *The convolution of two polyexponential functions in one variable of given bases is, again, a polyexponential function in the same bases. Furthermore, the degree of the polynomials in the convolution is at most one plus the sum of the degrees of the polynomials in the polyexponentials being convolved.*

PROOF. It suffices to do this for the two functions

$$g_1(k) = \alpha^k k^s \quad \text{and} \quad g_2(k) = \beta^k k^t \tag{2.12}$$

for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and non-negative integers s, t. In the case $\alpha = \beta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(g_1 * g_2)(k) &= \sum_{j=0}^{k} g_1(j)g_2(k-j) \\ &= \alpha^k \sum_{j=0}^{k} (k-j)^s j^t\end{aligned}$$

We now examine this sum

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{k} (k-j)^s j^t &= \sum_{j=0}^{k}\sum_{i=0}^{s} \binom{s}{i} k^i (-1)^{s-i} j^{s+t-i} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{s} (-1)^{s-i}\binom{s}{i} k^i \sum_{j=0}^{k} j^{s+t-i}\end{aligned}$$

Sums of the type $\sum_{j=0}^{k} j^p$ are known to be polynomials in k of degree $p+1$ and so we can conclude that $(g_1 * g_2)(k) = \alpha^k p(k)$ for some polynomial $p(k)$ of degree at most $s+t+1$.

For the case where $\alpha \neq \beta$, we remark that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} x^{k-j} y^j = \frac{x^{k+1} - y^{k+1}}{x - y},$$

which proves the theorem for $g_1 * g_2$ as in (2.12) for $s = t = 0$. For larger values of s, t, we remark that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} x^{k-j} y^j = \frac{x^{k+1}}{x-y} + \frac{y^{k+1}}{y-x} = h(x,y) + h(y,x)$$

where

$$h(x,y) = \frac{x^{k+1}}{x-y}.$$

Differentiating the equation

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} x^{k-j} y^j = h(x,y) + h(y,x)$$

s times in x and t times in y yields

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k-j}{s}\binom{j}{t} x^{k-j-s} y^{j-t} = h_{s,t,k}(x,y) + h_{t,s,k}(y,x), \tag{2.13}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} h_{s,t,k}(x,y) &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)^t \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^s \left(x^{k+1}(x-y)^{-1}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^s \left[x^{k+1} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\right)^t (x-y)^{-1}\right] \\ &= (t-1)!(-1)^t \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^s \left[x^{k+1}(x-y)^{-1-t}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

By induction on s, with base case $s = 0$, we see that

$$h_{s,t,k}(x,y) = \sum_{i=0}^{s} x^{k+1-i}(x-y)^{-1-t-s+i} g_{s,t,i}(k)$$

where, for fixed s, t, i, $g_{s,t,i}(k)$ is a polynomial in k of degree i. It follows that for fixed $\alpha \neq \beta$ we have that for fixed s, t,

$$h_{s,t,k}(\alpha,\beta) = \alpha^k p_{s,t}(k),$$

where $p_{s,t}$ is a polynomial of degree s in t (depending on s, t, α, β). In view of (2.13), for fixed $\alpha \neq \beta$ we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k-j}{s}\binom{j}{t} \alpha^{k-j-s}\beta^{j-t} = \alpha^k p_{s,t}(k) + \beta^k q_{t,s}(k) \tag{2.14}$$

where $p_{s,t}(k)$ is as above, and where $q_{t,s}(k)$ is a polynomial of degree t. But

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k-j}{s}\binom{j}{t} \alpha^{k-j-s}\beta^{j-t} = \alpha^{-s}\beta^{-t}(\widetilde{g}_1 * \widetilde{g}_2)(k), \tag{2.15}$$

where

$$\widetilde{g}_1(k) = \binom{k}{s}\alpha^k, \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{g}_2(k) = \binom{k}{t}\beta^k.$$

To establish the theorem for (2.12), it suffices to write k^s as a linear combination of

$$\binom{k}{0}, \binom{k}{1}, \ldots, \binom{k}{s}$$

(via Stirling coefficients) and similarly for k^t, and to apply (2.15) and (2.14). □

2.2.3. Functions of Bounded Growth. We are interested in results about the convolutions of two (or more) functions, when one or both functions are arbitrary functions satisfying some growth restrictions.

DEFINITION 2.2.7. We say that a function $g = g(k)$ defined on non-negative integers has *growth bounded by* ρ for some real $\rho > 0$, provided that there exists a positive constant c for which

$$|g(k)| \leq Ck^C\rho^k$$

THEOREM 2.2.8. *The convolution of any finite number of functions of growth ρ is again of growth ρ.*

PROOF. It is sufficient to consider the convolution of two functions, g_1, g_2; the general claim follows by repeated applications of the result for two functions. So consider

$$g(k) = \sum_{\substack{k_1+k_2=k \\ k_1,k_2\geq 0}} g_1(k_1)g_2(k_2)$$

with g_1, g_2 having growth bounded by ρ; for some constants C_1, C_2 we have

$$|g_1(k)| \leq C_1k^{C_1}\rho^k \quad \text{and} \quad |g_2(k)| \leq C_2k^{C_2}\rho^k$$

There are $k+1$ ways of writing k as the sum of two non-negative integers, k_1, k_1. For each such pair, (k_1, k_2), we have

$$|g_1(k_1)g_2(k_2)| \leq C_1C_2k_1^{C_1}k_2^{C_2}\rho^{k_1+k_2} \leq C_1C_2k^{C_1+C_2}\rho^k$$

Since there are at most $k+1$ pairs, (k_1, k_2), we have

$$|g(k)| \leq C_1C_2(k+1)k^{C_1+C_2}\rho^k$$

and so it follows that g has growth bounded by ρ. □

For reasons that go back to [**Fri91**], we will need to convolve polynomials and polyexponentials with functions for which we only have a growth rate bound.

DEFINITION 2.2.9. For any polynomial, $P = P(x)$, with real or complex coefficients, we define its *coefficient norm*, $\|P\|$ as the largest absolute value among its coefficients in its expansion by powers of x; i.e.,

$$\|s_0 + xs_1 + \cdots + x^ts_t\| = \max_i |s_i|$$

THEOREM 2.2.10. *For every non-negative integer D there is a constant, $C_2 = C_2(D)$, for which the following holds. Let $Q = Q(x)$ be any polynomial of degree at most D, and $h(r)$ a function defined on non-negative integers, r, for which*

$$|h(r)| \leq C_1r^D\rho^r$$

for some positive constants, C_1 and ρ with $\rho < 1$. Then the infinite sum,

$$q(x) = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} Q(x-s)h(s)$$

converges in coefficient norm, and has degree at most that of Q, and satisfies

$$\|q\| \leq C_1 C_2 (1-\rho)^{-2D} \|Q\|$$

The same is true of

$$q_k(x) = \sum_{s=k+1}^{\infty} Q(x-s)h(s)$$

except the norm coefficient bound of q_k is given by

$$\|q_k\| \leq C_1 C_2 k^{2D} (1-\rho)^{-2D} \rho^k \|Q\|$$

Hence

$$|(Q*h)(k) - q(k)| = |q_k(k)| \leq C_1 C_2 \|Q\| k^{3D} \rho^k (1-\rho)^{-2D}$$

PROOF. The statement on the convergence and norms of q and q_h follow from Lemma 8.8 of [**Fri08**]; the fact that the sum begins with $r = 0$ just affects the constants slightly. For ease of reading, we review the proof, which goes back to [**Fri91**] (as the last step of the proof of Sublemma 2.16). The idea is that we can restrict ourselves to the cases where $Q(x) = x^i$ for some i between 0 and D. Then we write

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} Q(x-r)h(r) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (x-r)^i h(r) \tag{2.16}$$

and we expand the $(x-r)^i$ via the binomial theorem, and use an identity such as

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \binom{r}{\tau} \rho^r = \frac{\rho^\tau}{(1-\rho)^{\tau+1}}$$

to show the convergence to q for q_k, and obtain the coefficient norm estimate.

For the last statement, we see that

$$\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} Q(k-r)h(r)$$

is absolutely convergent, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}(Q*h)(k) &= \sum_{r=0}^{k} Q(x-r)h(r) \\ &= \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} Q(k-r)h(r) - \sum_{r=k+1}^{\infty} Q(k-r)h(r) \\ &= q(k) - q_k(k)\end{aligned}$$

But for $k \geq 1$, we have $q_k(x)$ is bounded in absolute value by $D+1$ times its largest monomial, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}|q_k(k)| \leq \|q_k\|(D+1)k^D &\leq C_1 C_2 k^{2D} (1-\rho)^{-2D} \rho^k \|Q\|(D+1)k^D \\ &\leq C_1 \|Q\| \rho^k (1-\rho)^{-2D} C_2 k^{3D}\end{aligned}$$

□

COROLLARY 2.2.11. *Fix a graph, B, with $\rho(H_B) > 1$. Fix a $D > 0$ and an $\varepsilon > 0$. Then for each $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\mu| > \rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon$ there exists a constant, C_2, for which the following is true. If $P(k) = k^i\mu^k$ with integer i with $0 \leq i \leq D$, and $h(r)$ satisfies $|h(r)| \leq C_1 r^D(\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon)^r$, for some constant $C_1 > 0$, then we have that*

$$p(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} P(x-i)h(i)$$

converges to a polyexponential function $p(k)$, and

$$|(P * h)(k) - p(k)| \leq C_2(\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon)^k$$

PROOF. We have

$$(P * h)(k) = \mu^k(\widetilde{P} * \widetilde{h}),$$

where

$$\widetilde{P}(k) = k^i, \quad \widetilde{h}(k) = \mu^{-k}h(k).$$

Hence

$$|\widetilde{h}(k)| \leq C_1 r^D \rho^k,$$

where

$$\rho \leq \frac{\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon}{|\mu|} .$$

Hence $1 - \rho$, for a given d and ε, is bounded away from zero. Now we apply Theorem 2.2.10. □

2.2.4. Weighted Convolutions of B-Ramanujan Functions.

DEFINITION 2.2.12. Let $g_1, \ldots, g_s$ be functions on non-negative integers. Let $\vec{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_s)$ be a s-tuple of positive integers. The *weighted convolution of the g_i with weights $\vec{m}$*, denoted $(g_1 * \ldots * g_s)_{\vec{m}}$, is defined to be

$$(g_1 * \ldots * g_s)_{\vec{m}}(k) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{m}\cdot\vec{k}=k \\ \vec{k}\geq\vec{0}}} g(k_1)\ldots g(k_s);$$

if $\vec{k}_0 = (k_1^0, \ldots, k_s^0)$ is a s-tuple of non-negative integers, we define the *truncated weighted convolution*, denoted $(g_1 * \ldots * g_s)_{\vec{m}}^{\vec{k}_0}$, to be

$$(g_1 * \ldots * g_s)_{\vec{m}}^{\vec{k}_0}(k) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{m}\cdot\vec{k}=k \\ \vec{k}\geq\vec{k}_0}} g(k_1)\ldots g(k_s).$$

This changes very little for the analysis, but is what we will be using for our certified trace.

Notice that if we want to work with functions, g_i, defined on positive integers, as opposed to non-negative integers, we can work with the above truncated weighted convolution with $\vec{k}_0$ replaced with $\max(\vec{1}, \vec{k}_0)$, where $\vec{1}$ is the vector whose components are all equal to 1.

EXAMPLE 2.2.13. Consider the case where $g_1(k) = g_2(k) = (d-1)^k$ and $\vec{m} = (1, 2)$, then the identity on partial sums of geometric series

$$1 + x + \ldots + x^t = \frac{x^{t+1} - 1}{x - 1}$$

with $x = d-1$ easily gives

$$(g_1 * g_2)_{\vec{m}}(k) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{d-2}\left((d-1)^{k+1} - (d-1)^{k/2}\right) & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \\ \frac{1}{d-2}\left((d-1)^{k} - (d-1)^{(k+1)/2}\right) & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

This is not an exact polyexponential function, but it is a B-Ramanujan function.

In Section 3.5 we remark that the above convolution can be described as a *Mod-S function*, and the exact value of such convolutions of polyexponential functions may be of interest.

THEOREM 2.2.14. *Let $\vec{m} \geq \vec{1}$ and $\vec{k}_0 \geq \vec{1}$. Let $g_1, \ldots, g_s$ be B-Ramanujan functions, then the (truncated) weighted convolution*

$$(g_1 * \ldots * g_s)_{\vec{m}}^{\vec{k}_0}$$

is B-Ramanujan as well.

PROOF. First, it suffices to prove this in the case $s = 2$; the case of general s follows by repeated application of the $s = 2$ result. Hence $\vec{k} = (k_1, k_2)$ and $\vec{m} = (m_1, m_2)$.

Second, observe that a change of variable

$$\kappa_1 = k_1 - k_1^0 + 1 \qquad \kappa_2 = k_2 - k_1^0 + 1$$

allows us, without loss of generality, to remove the truncated condition. So, we assume that $\vec{k}_0 = \vec{1}$.

At this point we need to check a few special cases. Namely, if the function g_i is B-Ramanujan, then we can write

$$g_i(k) = \sum_{\ell \in L} p_{\ell,i}(k)\ell^k + \operatorname{error}_i(k)$$

where $p_{\ell,i}$ is a polynomial, where L is the set of eigenvalues of H_B (it suffices to take L to be the eigenvalues greater than $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$ in absolute), and where the error bound is such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$|\operatorname{error}_i(k)| \leq C(\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon)^k$$

for some constant $C = C(i, \varepsilon)$. The set L is always finite; hence we it suffices to consider we can assume that for $i = 1, 2$ we have either g_i is a simple polyexponential function, of the form

$$g_i(k) = p_{\ell,i}(k)\ell^k$$

or $g_i(k)$ is an "error term" function, i.e., for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a C for which

$$|g_i(k)| \leq C\big(\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon\big)^k. \tag{2.17}$$

and treat each of the four corresponding cases for $i = 1, 2$; of course, there are essentially three cases, namely the g_i are (1) both "error terms," (2) both simple polyexponentials as above, and (3) one of each. Note that in either case, we have that

$$|g_i(k)| \leq \widetilde{C} k^{\widetilde{C}} \rho^k(H_B)$$

for some constant $\widetilde{C}$, since $\rho(H_B)$ is the largest possible Hashimoto eigenvalue.

Let us consider now, the case where both g_i are error terms functions. Given any $\widetilde{\varepsilon} > 0$, choose an ε with $0 < \varepsilon < \widetilde{\varepsilon}$. Since the g_i are both error terms, there is a C such that for $i = 1, 2$ we have that (2.17) holds, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}|(g_i * g_2)(k)| &\leq \sum_{m_1k_1+m_2k_2=k} C^2(\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon)^{k_1+k_2} \\ &\leq C^2 \cdot \#\{(k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{\geq 1} \mid m_1k_1 + m_2k_2 = k\} \cdot (\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon)^k \\ &\leq C^2 \cdot (k-1)(\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon)^k,\end{aligned}$$

since for each of the $k-1$ possible values of $k_1 = 1, \ldots, k-1$ there can be at most one value of k_2. Since we have $\varepsilon < \widetilde{\varepsilon}$, for some C' we have

$$C^2 \cdot (k-1)(\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \varepsilon)^k \leq C'(\rho^{1/2}(H_B) + \widetilde{\varepsilon})^k$$

for all integers $k \geq 0$. Hence $(g_1 * g_2)_{\vec{m}}$ is B-Ramanujan.

For each of the remaining cases regarding the g_i, we will consider separately three subcases: (1) when $m_1 = m_2 = 1$, (2) when $m_1, m_2 \geq 2$ and (3) when $m_1 = 1, m_2 \geq 2$.

Consider (1), when $m_1 = m_2 = 1$. Then if g_1 and g_2 are both polyexponential functions, Theorem 2.2.6 shows that their convolution is polyexponential as well and hence a B-Ramanujan function. In the case where g_1 is polyexponential while g_2 is an error term, Corollary 2.2.11 shows that their convolution is a B-Ramanujan function.

We can treat both cases when $m_1, m_2 \geq 2$ simply using the fact that $g_i(k) \leq \widetilde{C}k^{\widetilde{C}}\rho^k(H_B)$. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|(g_i * g_2)(k)| &\leq \sum_{m_1k_1+m_2k_2=k} |g_1(k_1)g_2(k_2)| \\ &\leq \sum_{m_1k_1+m_2k_2=k} C_1k_1^{C_1}k_2^{C_1}\rho^{k_1+k_2}(H_B)) \\ &\leq (\rho(H_B))^{k/2} \sum_{m_1k_1+m_2k_2=k} C_1k_1^{C_1}k_2^{C_1}\end{aligned}$$

since if $m_1, m_2 \geq 2$ we have that $k_1 + k_2 \leq k/2$. Since, as before, there are at most $k-1$ tuples (k_1, k_2) for which $m_1k_1 + m_2k_2 = k$, we have Hence, for some constant C_2 we have

$$|(g_i * g_2)(k)| \leq (\rho(H_B))^{k/2}C_2k^{C_2},$$

which is a B-Ramanujan function.

Finally, let us consider (3), when $m_1 = 1$, $m = m_2 \geq 2$. We need to consider the case where g_1, g_2 are either both simple polyexponentials, or one is a simple polyexponential and the other an error term.

For the case where g_1 is an error term means that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a C for which

$$g_1(k_1)g_2(k_2) \leq C(\rho(H_B) + \varepsilon)^{k/2}$$

for any k_1 and k_2 for which $m_1k_1 + m_2k_2 = k$, since $m_2 \geq 2$, and this case is handled like the case where g_1, g_2 are both error terms.

The case where g_1 is a polyexponential, means that if we set $k' = m_2k_2$, we have

$$(g_1 * g_2)_{\vec{m}} = (g_1 * g_2')_{(1,1)},$$

where $g_2'(k')$ is defined to be zero if k' is not a multiple of m_2, and otherwise $g_2'(k') = g_2(k'/m_2)$. Hence g_2' satisfies the bounds of an "error term," and this case reduces to the case where g_1 is polyexponential and g_2' is an error term as above. □

2.2.5. Walk Statistics. One important lemma in [**Fri91, Fri08**] described the number of walks of length k in a graph, and a weighted sum of such walks, where the weights are polynomials in the number of time certain vertices are visited. Such results concern adjacency matrices in our case, but are much more general.

LEMMA 2.2.15. *Let M be an $r \times r$ matrix with complex entries. Fix an integer, t, and fix any $2t$ integers between 1 and r, $b_1, \ldots, b_{2t}$. For non-negative integer, k, let*

$$f(k) = \sum_{\substack{k_1,k_2,\ldots,k_t \\ k_1+\cdots+k_t=k}} (M^{k_1})_{b_1,b_2} \ldots (M^{k_t})_{b_{2t-1},b_{2t}},$$

where the sum is over all non-negative integers, k_i, whose sum is k. Then we have

$$f(k) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathrm{Spec}(M)} \nu^k p_\nu(k), \tag{2.18}$$

where ν ranges over all the eigenvalues of M, and $p_\nu(k)$ is a polynomial in k. Furthermore, if the Jordan canonical form of M has blocks whose block size are at most s, then each p_ν is of degree at most ts; in particular, if M is diagonalizable, then each p_ν is of degree at most t.

PROOF. It follows from the Jordan canonical form of M that for each $b, b' \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ we have that for non-negative integer, k, we have

$$f(k) = (M^k)_{b,b'}$$

is of the form given in (2.18), where the degree of each p_ν is bounded by the size of the largest Jordan block of M. Now we apply Theorem 2.2.6. □

This gives us an important fact about what we call a "weighted sum of matrix power entries of M" as follows.

COROLLARY 2.2.16. *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ be indeterminates, and let M be an $r \times r$ matrix, each of entries is a complex number times one of the x_i ($1 \le i \le s$). Let M_1 be M where each x_i is set to 1. For each tuple of non-negative integers, $\vec{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_s)$, define* $\mathrm{Weight}_{\vec{t}}$ *on monomials in $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ via*

$$\mathrm{Weight}_{\vec{t}}(x_1^{e_1} \ldots x_s^{e_s}) = e_1^{t_1} \ldots e_s^{t_s}$$

where $e_1, \ldots, e_s$ are non-negative integers; extend $\mathrm{Weight}_{\vec{t}}$ *to be a function on all polynomials in $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ by linearity, i.e., for*

$$p(x_1, \ldots, x_s) = \sum_{e_1,\ldots,e_s} c_{e_1,\ldots,e_s} x_1^{e_1} \ldots x_s^{e_s},$$

where $c_{e_1,\ldots,e_s} \in \mathbb{C}$, and the above sum is over a finite set of tuples of non-negative integers $(e_1, \ldots, e_s)$, we define

$$\mathrm{Weight}_{\vec{t}}(p(x)) = \sum_{e_1,\ldots,e_s} c_{e_1,\ldots,e_s} e_1^{t_1} \ldots e_s^{t_s}.$$

Then for any fixed $\vec{t}$, we have

$$f(k) = \mathrm{Weight}_{\vec{t}}\left(M^k\right)$$

is a function of the form (2.18)*, where the ν range over the eigenvalues of M_1. If the largest Jordan block of M_1 is of size ℓ, then the degree of each p_ν is at most $(t_1 + \ldots + t_r)\ell$.*

PROOF. Again, because $1, z, z^2, \ldots, z^t$ are linear combinations of

$$1, z, \binom{z}{2}, \ldots, \binom{z}{t},$$

it suffices to show this for

$$f(k) = \left(\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right)^{t_1} \cdots \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_s}\right)^{t_s} M^k\right)_{x_1=\cdots=x_s=1}.$$

By the product rule, this derivative is the same as the sum of each way of applying the $t = t_1 + \cdots + t_r$ partial derivatives to each of the k M's that form the product M^k; furthermore, any two applications of a partial derivative to the same M results in zero. Hence, these t partial derivatives amount to a sum

$$M_1^{k_0} M[1] M_1^{k_1} M[2] \ldots M_1^{k_t} M[t] M_1^{k_{t+1}},$$

over all $k_1 + \cdots + k_t + k_{t+1} = k - t$, with a sum over all $M[1], \ldots, M[t]$, where $M[i]$ is a partial derivative of M with respect to one of $x_1, \ldots, x_s$, depending on the order that the differentiation operators are applied to the product of k of the M's. For each fixed $M[1], \ldots, M[t]$, expanding in the entries of the $M[i]$ yields a sum as in Lemma 2.2.15 (with t being $t+1$). □

In this paper, we use Corollary 2.2.16 only in the following special case.

COROLLARY 2.2.17. *Let B be a graph, and for each $e \in E_B$, let us fix a non-negative integer ℓ_e. Consider for any $e_1, e_2 \in E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}$*

$$f(k; e_1, e_2) = \sum_{w \in \mathrm{NB}_k(e_1, e_2, B)} \prod_{e \in E_B} \left(a_e(w)\right)^{\ell_e},$$

where the sum is over all non-backtracking walks in B of length k whose first edge is e_1 and whose last edge is e_2, and $a_e(w)$ denotes the number of times w traverses a directed edge in the equivalence class of e (i.e., if e is not a half-loop, then there are two directed edges in the equivalence class of e). Then $f(k)$ is a function of the form (2.18)*, where ν ranges over all Hashimoto eigenvalues of B.*

PROOF. Consider the indeterminates $\{x_e\}_{e \in E_B}$, and the matrix, M, obtained by taking the Hashimoto matrix of B and replacing each non-zero entry in the (e, e') entry by the entry x_e. Now apply Corollary 2.2.16. □

2.3. Walk Sums

In this section, we show that the expected value in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ of the k-th power Hashimoto trace has an $1/n$-asymptotic expansion which satisfies, for any integer r,

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\ \mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\ \right] = f_0(k) + \frac{f_1(k)}{n} + \ldots + \frac{f_{r-1}(k)}{n^{r-1}} + \frac{\mathrm{error}(r,k)}{n^r}$$

where the f_i are functions of k and with an upper bound on the error term of

$$|\operatorname{error}(r,k)| \leq ck^{2r+2}(\rho(H_B))^k$$

for some c depending only on r and B. Furthermore, such an expansion is obtained for a broader notion of trace that we call a *walk sum*.

To obtain this result, we observe that the trace of the k-th power of the Hashimoto matrix is the number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks of length k. We generalize this notion with the definition of a walk sum, which counts the number of walks satisfying certain properties, and in this context, show that the expected number of walks has the desired asymptotic expansion. This follows and expands on the theory that was developed by Friedman in [**Fri91**] and used in [**Fri08**].

2.3.1. Potential Walks. We consider a probabilistic theory describing walks on a random cover of the base graph B. Consider the probability space $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. For the purpose of this section, the base graph does not need to be d-regular.

Definition 2.3.1. A (k,n)-*potential walk* is a pair $(w;\vec{t})$ consisting of a walk, called the *base walk*

$$w = (v_0, e_1, v_1, e_2, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$$

in the base graph B of length k; and a vector, called the *trajectory*

$$\vec{t} = (t_0, \ldots, t_k)$$

with each $t_i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We refer to k as the *length* and n as the *size* of the potential walk. Given $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, we say that a (k,n)-potential walk $(w;\vec{t})$ is *attained in* G if the vector $\vec{t}$ represents an actual walk in G, that is, with the above notations, if

$$\sigma_{e_i}(t_{i-1}) = t_i \quad \forall i = 1, \ldots, k, \tag{2.19}$$

where $G = B[\sigma]$ and $\sigma\colon E_B^{\mathrm{dir}} \to \mathcal{S}_n$ is the permutation assignment from which G arises. We denote by $\mathcal{E}(w;\vec{t})$ the event in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ that the potential walk is attained in G and denote by $P(w;\vec{t})$ the probability of this event. A (k,n)-potential walk is *feasible* if $P(w;\vec{t}) > 0$. If a potential walk, $(w;\vec{t})$, is attained in some $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, then $(w;\vec{t})$ represents a walk, w', in G, and we denote its graph, in the sense of Definition 1.3.1 (i.e., the graph formed by the vertices and edges occurring in w') by $\operatorname{Graph}(w;\vec{t})$, and call it the *graph of the potential walk,* $(w;\vec{t})$; clearly $\operatorname{Graph}(w;\vec{t})$ depends only on $(w;\vec{t})$, and this graph comes with a natural morphism to B via the walk, w, in B.

Proposition 1.2.2 shows that a potential walk is feasible iff the morphism from the graph of the potential walk to B is étale. Below we give an alternative characterization of the feasibility of a potential walk, akin to that in [**Fri08**], Chapter 5, Section 1. We shall not need it here, but the reader may find it helpful to gain intuition regarding this concept. This lemma is a corollary of Proposition 1.2.2, although it not hard to prove without this proposition.

Lemma 2.3.2. *A (k,n)-potential walk $(w;\vec{t})$, with*

$$w = (v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k),$$

is feasible if and only if the following two feasibility conditions hold:

(1) for any i, j such that $e_i = e_j$ we have

$$t_{i-1} = t_{j-i} \iff t_i = t_j \ ;$$

and

(2) and for any i, j such that $e_i = e_j^{-1}$, we have

$$t_{i-1} = t_j \iff t_i = t_{j-1} \ .$$

DEFINITION 2.3.3. Consider a (k, n)-potential walk $(w; \vec{t})$, and its graph, $\text{Graph}(w; \vec{t})$. If $e \in E_B$ is an edge in the base graph, we define $a_e = a_e(w; \vec{t})$ to be the number of edges in the associated graph of the potential walk in the fibre of the edge e. And if $v \in V_B$ is a vertex in the base graph, we define $b_v = b_v(w; \vec{t})$ to be the number of vertices in the associated graph of the potential walk which is in the fibre of the vertex v. Hence we have that

$$\sum_{e \in E_B} a_e = |E_{\text{Graph}(w;\vec{t})}| \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{v \in V_B} b_v = |V_{\text{Graph}(w;\vec{t})}|$$

and we denote by $\chi(w; \vec{t}) = |V_{\text{Graph}(w;\vec{t})}| - |E_{\text{Graph}(w;\vec{t})}|$ the *Euler characteristic* of the associated graph. Following the work of Friedman, we define the *order* of a potential walk $(w; \vec{t})$ to be the non-negative integer $\text{ord}(w; \vec{t}) = -\chi(w; \vec{t})$.

We will eventually regroup potential walks with similar graphs under our notion of forms and types. First we describe an obvious equivalence class among potential walks and their associated graph.

DEFINITION 2.3.4. Fix a base walk $w = (v_0, e_1, v_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k)$. We say that two trajectories of length k and size at most n, $\vec{t}$ and $\vec{s}$, *differ by a symmetry* and denote this by $\vec{t} \sim_w \vec{s}$ if they only differ by a permutation of the vertices in each fibre; that is if there exists a collection of permutations of n elements $\tau = \{\tau_v\}_{v \in V_B}$ such that $\vec{s} = \tau(\vec{t})$ that is if

$$s_i = \tau_{v_i}(t_i) \quad i = 0, \ldots k$$

This is a modification of the original definition in [**Fri08**] that accounts for the multiple vertices of the base graph. Indeed, consider the following two examples. First, if the base walk is a loop, then the trajectories $(1, 1)$ and $(1, 2)$ are not equivalent since the fist one yields a loop and the second an edge; but if the base walk is not a loop, then these trajectories are equivalent since they both yield an edge (they refer to vertices in different fibres of the base graph). With this definition we guarantee that if $\vec{t} \sim_w \vec{s}$ then $P(w; \vec{t}) = P(w; \vec{s})$. Define the (n, w)-*equivalence symmetry class of* $\vec{t}$ to be

$$[\vec{t}]_{n,w} = \{\vec{s} \mid \vec{s} \sim_w \vec{t} \text{ and } s_i \leq n,\ i = 1, \ldots, k\}$$

We may omit the n subscript of n is understood. We denote by $[w; \vec{t}]_n$ the equivalence class of all potential walk with base walk w whose trajectories are in the equivalence class $[\vec{t}]_{n,w}$, that is

$$[w; \vec{t}]_n = \{(w; \vec{s}) \mid \vec{s} \in [\vec{t}]_{n,w}\}$$

and we also say that these potential walk *differ by a symmetry*. Clearly, if two potential (k, n)-walks differ by a symmetry, then their associated graphs are canonically isomorphic (the isomorphism being given by the collection of permutation) and hence the quantities a_e and b_v are identical in the equivalence class for all e and v.

2.3.2. Walk Sums. We make the following observation. If H_G is the Hashimoto matrix of a random covering graph G, then

$$\mathbb{E}_n\left[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)\right] = \sum_{(w;\vec{t})\in\mathcal{W}} P(w;\vec{t})$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of all potential (k,n)-walks $(w;\vec{t})$ whose walk w is a closed strictly non-backtracking walk of length k in the base graph B. We want to generalize this to allow the use of some other "traces," that is sums of $P(w;\vec{t})$ over appropriate w's and $\vec{t}$'s.

DEFINITION 2.3.5. A *walk collection*, $\mathcal{W} = \{\mathcal{W}(k,n)\}_{k,n\geq 1}$, is a collection where for any two positive integers k and n the elements of the set $\mathcal{W}(k,n)$ are (k,n)-potential walks satisfying the following conditions:

(1) *Symmetry:* The walk collection contains all trajectories that differ by a symmetry; that is, if $(w;\vec{t}) \in \mathcal{W}(k,n)$ then $[w;\vec{t}]_n \subseteq \mathcal{W}(k,n)$.
(2) *Size invariance:* The walk collection reflects the fact that the size of a walk isn't uniquely determined; that is, if $(w;\vec{t}) \in \mathcal{W}(k,n)$ then $(w;\vec{t}) \in \mathcal{W}(k,m)$ for all $m \geq \max\{t_i \mid \vec{t} = (t_0,t_1,\ldots,t_k)\}$
(3) *Strictly non-backtracking closed walks:* All associated graphs of potential walks in the walk collection are strictly non-backtracking closed walks in the sense of Definition 1.1.6; that is, in the notation of Definition 2.3.1 we have $v_0 = v_k$, $t_0 = t_k$, no two successive edges of w are inverses of each other, and the same for e_k and e_1.

We remark that this is a generalization of the notion of a *SSIIC walk collection*, Definition 5.2 of [**Fri08**], with *SSIIC* an acronym for "symmetric, size invariant, irreducible, closed;" however in this paper we are only interested in walk sums that satisfy conditions (1)–(4) above, and hence we make this part of the definition.

Given a walk collection, $\mathcal{W}$, its associated (k,n)-*modified* $\mathcal{W}$ *trace* (we often drop the $\mathcal{W}$ when it is understood) is the random variable, $\mathcal{W}_n$, defined on $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, given by

$$\mathcal{W}_n(G,k) = \#\{(w;\vec{t}) \in \mathcal{W}(k,n) \mid (w;\vec{t}) \text{ is attained in } G\}$$

if $G = G[\sigma] \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, meaning that (2.19) is satisfied for the permutation assignment σ that gives rise to G. (In general, it is usually simpler to write G rather than $G[\sigma]$.)

Given a walk collection, $\mathcal{W}$, its associated (k,n)-*walk sum* is

$$\mathrm{WalkSum}(\mathcal{W},k,n) = \sum_{(w;\vec{t})\in\mathcal{W}(k,n)} P(w;\vec{t})$$

Note that this sum is always a finite sum (assuming the base graph B is finite).

EXAMPLE 2.3.6. We denote by $\mathrm{SNBC} = \{\mathrm{SNBC}(k,n)\}_{k,n\geq 1}$ the walk collection of all strictly non-backtracking closed walks of length k and size n. Its associated (k,n)-modified trace is simply the k-th Hashimoto trace:

$$\mathrm{SNBC}_n(G,k) = \mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$$

(thought of as a random variable on $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$) and its associated (k,n)-walk sum is simply the expected value of the k-th Hashimoto trace:

$$\mathrm{WalkSum}(\mathrm{SNBC},k,n) = \mathbb{E}_n[\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)]$$

This walk collection is the largest possible, that is, any other walk collection consists of subsets of this one.

Since walk collections are symmetric, we can regroup the terms of the above sum by grouping trajectories that differ by a symmetry.

DEFINITION 2.3.7. Let

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}(w;\vec{t})_n = \sum_{\vec{s}\in[\vec{t}]_{n,w}} P(w;\vec{s})$$

then we have

$$\mathrm{WalkSum}(\mathcal{W},k,n) = \sum_{(w;[\vec{t}]_{n,w})\in\mathcal{W}(k,n)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}(w;\vec{t})_n \tag{2.20}$$

Now we comment on $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}(w;\vec{t})_n$ and will later use this to work out an asymptotic expansion of a walk sum.

PROPOSITION 2.3.8. *Let $(w;\vec{t})$ be a potential (k,n)-walk then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}(w;\vec{t})_n = \prod_{v\in V_B} \frac{n!}{(n-b_v)!} \prod_{e\in E_B} \frac{(n-a_e)!}{n!} \tag{2.21}$$

with a_e and b_v as in Definition 2.3.3, provided that B has no half-loops; for each $e\in E_B$ that is a half-loop, we replace

$$\frac{(n-a_e)!}{n!} \quad \textit{by} \quad \frac{(n-2a_e)!_{\mathrm{odd}}}{n!_{\mathrm{odd}}}$$

for n even, where for m even, $m!_{\mathrm{odd}}$ is the odd factorial *(also sometimes called the* double factorial *in the literature)*

$$m!_{\mathrm{odd}} = (m-1)(m-3)\ldots\cdot 3\cdot 1.$$

PROOF. Since all potential walks considered differ by a symmetry, the probability that they occur in a random cover is the same. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\vec{t}\in[\vec{t}]_{n,w}$ and hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}(w;\vec{t})_n &= \sum_{\vec{s}\in[\vec{t}]_{n,w}} P(w;\vec{s}) \\ &= \left|[\vec{t}]_{n,w}\right| \cdot P(w;\vec{t})\end{aligned}$$

and we evaluate each term separately.

First to compute the size of the equivalence class $[\vec{t}]_{n,w}$, we only need to consider how we can shuffle the vertices in the fibre of a vertex of the base graph. If there are b_v elements of the trajectory $\vec{t}$ in the fibre of the vertex v then there are $n(n-1)\ldots(n-b_v+1)$ ways to choose those vertices among n possible and this is true for the fibre of each vertex $v\in V_B$ of the base graph.

A random covering $B[\sigma]$ is given by the choice of a collection of permutations $\sigma=\{\sigma_e\}_{e\in E_B}$. Assume B has no half-loops; if there are a_e edges of the associated graph to the potential walk that are in the fibre of the base edge e, then it means that there are a_e values of the permutation σ_e that are determined by the walk. The other $n-a_e$ values can thus be chosen at random. This implies that there are $(n-a_e)!$ permutations out of the possible $n!$ which satisfy the conditions imposed by the potential walk on the choice of the permutation σ_e. Doing this for each edge

of the base graph concludes the proof. If B has half-loops, then we replace the factorials by double factorials since σ_e is a random perfect matching. □

2.3.3. Asymptotic Expansion. Again, begin with the assumption that B has no half-loops. We can rewrite (2.21) as

$$n^{\chi(w;\vec{t})} \prod_{v\in V_B} n(n-1)\dots(n-b_v+1) \prod_{e\in E_B} \frac{1}{n(n-1)\dots(n-a_e+1)},$$

where $\chi(w;\vec{t})$ is the Euler characteristic of the graph traced out (i.e., subgraph in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$) of $(w;\vec{t})$. Consider the power series expansions about $x = 0$ of

$$(1-x)(1-2x)\dots(1-mx) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{(1-x)(1-2x)\dots(1-mx)}$$

The x^i coefficient is a polynomial of degree at most $2i$ in m; see [**Fri91**], Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9. Using this for $x = 1/n$, we can deduce that there must exist polynomials $p_0, p_1, \dots$ in the variables a_e and b_v for $e \in E_B$ and $v \in V_B$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{symm}}(w;\vec{t})_n = n^{\chi(w;\vec{t})} \sum_{i\geq 0} p_i(\vec{a},\vec{b}) \frac{1}{n^i} \tag{2.22}$$

Definition 2.3.9. We call the polynomials $p_0, p_1, \dots$ the *expansion polynomials* of the potential walk.

We now comment on this expansion and in particular, its truncated form.

Theorem 2.3.10. *For any (k,n)-potential walk $(w;\vec{t})$ with $k \leq n/2$ and any integer $r \geq 1$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\text{symm}}(w;\vec{t})_n = n^{\chi(w;\vec{t})} \left(p_0 + \frac{p_1}{n} + \dots + \frac{p_{r-1}}{n^{r-1}} + \frac{\text{error}(k,n)}{n^r} \right) \tag{2.23}$$

where the p_i are the expansion polynomials of the potential walk $(w;\vec{t})$ in the variables $\{a_e\}_{e\in E_V}, \{b_v\}_{v\in V_B}$ and with

$$|\,\text{error}(k,n)| \leq ck^{2r} \tag{2.24}$$

where c is a constant that depends only on r (and B).

Proof. Consider a function of the form

$$g(x) = (1-\alpha_1 x)\dots(1-\alpha_s x)(1-\beta_1 x)^{-1}\dots(1-\beta_t x)^{-1}$$

where α_i and β_j are positive constants. The i^{th}-derivative of this function satisfies the bound

$$\left|\frac{g^{(i)}(x)}{i!}\right| \leq (1-x\,\beta_{\max})^{-i} \left(\sum \alpha_j + \sum \beta_j\right)^i$$

where $\beta_{\max}$ is the maximum of the β_k (by equation (6) in [**Fri91**] on page 339). Using Taylor's theorem about $x = 0$ we obtain that there must exist some $\xi \in [0, 1/n]$ such that

$$|\,\text{error}(k,n)| \leq (1-\xi\,\beta_{\max})^{-r} \left(\sum \alpha_j + \sum \beta_j\right)^r$$

On the interval $[0,1[$ we have that $(1-x)^{-1} \leq e^{x/(1-x)}$ and since $\beta_{\max} \leq k$ we have $(1-\xi\,\beta_{\max})^{-r} \leq e^{rk/(n-k)}$. If $k \leq n/2$ we have that $e^{rk/(n-k)} \leq e^r$, hence a constant that only depends on r. The $\sum \alpha_j$ represents the sum for all $v \in V_B$ of all sums of $0, 1, \dots, b_v - 1$, and the $\sum \beta_j$ represents the sum of all $e \in E_B$ of

$0, 1, \ldots, a_e - 1$, both of which are at most $0+1+\ldots+k-1 = \binom{k}{2}$. Since $2\binom{k}{2} \leq k^2$ we get the second part of the claimed error term. □

We now study the error term of the truncated expansion.

DEFINITION 2.3.11. Let $\mathcal{W}$ be a walk collection and $r \geq 1$ a positive integer. We define the *r-truncated form of $\mathcal{W}$*, $\mathcal{W}_{<r}$ to be the walk collection of those elements of $\mathcal{W}$ of order less than r. We define its *r-truncated (k,n)-modified trace* to be the random variable, $\mathcal{W}_{n,<r}$, defined on $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with

$$\mathcal{W}_{n,<r}(G,k) = \{(w;\vec{t}) \in \mathcal{W}(k,n) \mid (w;\vec{t}) \text{ is attained in } G \text{ and } \operatorname{ord}(w;\vec{t}) < r\}$$

and we define its associated *r-truncated (k,n)-walk sum* to be

$$\operatorname{WalkSum}_{<r}(\mathcal{W},k,n) = \sum_{\substack{(w;\vec{t})\in\mathcal{W}(k,n)\\ \operatorname{ord}(w;\vec{t})<r}} P(w;\vec{t})$$

We note that the proof of Lemma 1.3.5 generalizes to walk sums.

LEMMA 2.3.12. *Let B be a graph without half-loops. For any walk collection, $\mathcal{W}$, and any positive integer, $r \geq 1$ and any $k \leq n/2$, we have that*

$$\operatorname{WalkSum}(\mathcal{W},k,n) = \operatorname{WalkSum}_{<r}(\mathcal{W},k,n) + O(k^{2r+2}n^{-r})\operatorname{Tr}(H_B^k),$$

where the constant in the $O(\ )$ notation depends only on r and B.

PROOF. Since any walk collection consists of a subcollection of the strictly non-backtracking closed walks in G, this is immediate from the bound of Lemma 1.3.5. □

We can use this now to prove an expansion theorem for any walk sum.

THEOREM 2.3.13. *Let B be a base graph, let $\mathcal{W}$ be a walk collection, and fix an integer $r \geq 1$. Then for all $k \leq n/2$ we have*

$$\operatorname{WalkSum}(\mathcal{W},k,n) = f_0(k) + \frac{f_1(k)}{n} + \ldots + \frac{f_{r-1}(k)}{n^{r-1}} + \operatorname{error}(r,n,k) \tag{2.25}$$

where

$$f_i(k) = \sum_{j=0}^{r-1-i} \sum_{(w;[\vec{t}])\in\mathcal{W}^j(k)} p_{i-j}(w;\vec{t}) \tag{2.26}$$

and where $\mathcal{W}^j(k)$ is the set of all equivalence classes of potential walks of length k and of order j, and with the error term satisfying

$$|\operatorname{error}(r,n,k)| \leq ck^{2r+2}\operatorname{Tr}(H_B^k)n^{-r}, \tag{2.27}$$

where c is a constant that depends only on r and B.

The point of this theorem is that we can truncate the asymptotic expansion of each f_i as in (2.26) and still retain the usual bound on the error term.

PROOF. (Compare with the proof of Theorem 5.9 in [**Fri08**].) By Lemma 2.3.12, it suffices to establish (2.25) with $\operatorname{WalkSum}(\mathcal{W},k,n)$ replaced with $\operatorname{WalkSum}_{<r}(\mathcal{W},k,n)$.

Fix a strictly non-backtracking closed word, w, in B. Using the notation in Lemma 1.3.5 and the notion of a *coincidence* there, we fix a value $i_0 \in \{1,\ldots,n\}$, and view the successive vertices, (v_j,i_j), $j = 1,\ldots,k$, in the walk over w as random

variables. Note that each successive value of i_j is either (1) determined by the previous vertex values (a "forced choice"), (2) a coincidence, where for some $m < j$ we return to a vertex $(v_m, i_m) = (v_j, i_j)$, or (3) the choice of a new vertex (v_j, i_j), and hence a new value of the permutation over the j-th edge, e_j of w (a "free, non-coincidence choice"). We note that if for each j we know whether the j-th vertex falls into cases (1), (2), or (3), and in case of (2) for which $m < j$ we have $(v_j, i_j) = (v_m, i_m)$, then we can construct the graph of the walk $(w; \vec{t})$, up to isomorphism. Notice also that whether we are in case (1) or (3) for a given i_j is determined by the previous $i_0, \ldots, i_{j-1}$. Hence the number of equivalence classes $(w; [\vec{t}])$ for a fixed w, of order $s \leq r-1$, is determined by a choice of up to $\binom{k}{s+1}$ coincidences and at most k choices of the values of m in each case (2). Hence the total number of classes $(w, [\vec{t}])$ is at most

$$\binom{k}{s+1} k^{s+1} \leq k^{2s+2}.$$

Combining equations 2.20 and 2.23, we truncate each symmetric $(w, [\vec{t}])$ expectation expansion at the n^{-r+1} term, which yields the f_i claimed in the theorem, with an error term bounded by

$$c_s k^{2r-2s}$$

where c_s is a constant that depends only on B and $s \leq r$. It follows that the total error introduced by truncating the expansions is at most

$$\sum_{s=1}^{r} c_s k^{2r-2s+2} k^{2s} \leq c k^{2r+2}.$$

for a c depending only on r and B. □

Such an expansion would give us the Alon Conjecture if we could show that the coefficients, $f_i(k)$ are B-Ramanujan functions for all values of r, for the walk sum consisting of all strictly non-backtracking closed walks. As we have explained, this is not the case for some sufficiently large i, and so we take a smaller walk sum, namely the certified trace.

2.3.4. Types and Forms. We finish this section with a subsection that describes how to rearrange the walk sum by examining more closely the shapes that the walks can take. Friedman first introduced the notions of types and forms in [**Fri91**] and then refined them in [**Fri08**]. We maintain the language and simplify the definitions here.

DEFINITION 2.3.14. A *type* is a tuple $\mathcal{T} = (T, \gamma_V, \gamma_E, \mathcal{L})$, where T is an oriented graph (sometimes called the *type graph* of $\mathcal{T}$), γ_V an ordering of the vertices of T, γ_E an ordering of the edges of T and $\mathcal{L} = (\mathcal{L}^t, \mathcal{L}^h)$, called the *lettering* of the type, where $\mathcal{L}^t, \mathcal{L}^h \colon E_T \to E_B$ are maps of oriented graphs called the *lettering at the tail* and the *lettering at the head* respectively. Additionally, we require the following two conditions to hold:

(1) All the vertices, except possibly the first vertex (in the ordering given by the type), are of degree at least three, and
(2) the lettering is *consistent*, that is, for any vertex $v \in V_T$ and any edges $f_1, f_2 \in E_T$ such that $t_T(f_1) = t_T(f_2)$ (respectively $h_T(f_1) = h_T(f_2)$) we have that $\mathcal{L}^t(f_1) \neq \mathcal{L}^t(f_2)$ (respectively $\mathcal{L}^h(f_1) \neq \mathcal{L}^h(f_2)$). In other

words, the lettering at the tail for two edges sharing their tail vertex is distinct, and similarly at the head.
(3) T is pruned (i.e., its first vertex is of degree at least two), and T is connected.

We remark that the lettering of a type determines which vertices in V_T are mapped to which vertices in B: indeed, if $v \in V_T$, then v is incident upon some edge, $e \in E_T$; so if $he = v$ (recall that T is oriented, so either $he = v$ or $te = v$) then v must be taken to $\mathcal{L}^h(e)$, and similarly if $te = v$.

DEFINITION 2.3.15. A *form of type* $\mathcal{T}$ is a tuple $\mathcal{F} = (F, \ell, \mathcal{E})$ where
(1) F is the underlying oriented graph of $\mathcal{T}$;
(2) (F, ℓ) is a variable-length graph, i.e., $\ell \colon E_F \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$; and
(3) $\mathcal{E}$ associates to each directed edge, $f \in E_F^{\text{dir}}$, of F a non-backtracking walk in B, $w(f)$, such that
   (a) $w(f)$ has length $\ell(f)$,
   (b) $w(f)$ is the reverse walk of $w(\iota_F e)$ (in the sense of Definition 1.1.6), and
   (c) $\mathcal{E}$ is consistent with the lettering, $\mathcal{L}$, of $\mathcal{T}$, in that the first edge in $w(f)$ is $\mathcal{L}^t(f)$ and the last edge is $\mathcal{L}^h(f)$.

Given a potential walk, $(w; \vec{t})$, there is a unique type, denoted $\mathcal{T}(w; \vec{t})$, and a unique form, denoted $\mathcal{F}(w; \vec{t})$, associated to it. The type and form are obtained by considering the graph, $\text{Graph}(w; \vec{t})$, of the potential walk (as in Definition 2.3.1), the walk w' in $\text{Graph}(w; \vec{t})$ given by $(w; \vec{t})$, and then:
(1) making V_T consist only of the initial vertex of w' and all vertices of degree at least three in $\text{Graph}(w; \vec{t})$;
(2) replacing each maximal beaded path between V_T vertices in $\text{Graph}(w; \vec{t})$ by a single edge of T;
(3) the vertices and edges of T are ordered as they occur in the walk, w', and the edges of V_T are oriented in the direction they are first traversed in w';
(4) each edge of the form takes its length and non-backtracking walk from the beaded path corresponding to the edge in $\text{Graph}(w; \vec{t})$; and
(5) the lettering of an edge in V_T is taken from first and last edges of the corresponding beaded path in $\text{Graph}(w; \vec{t})$ in the direction it is first traversed (from which the edge gets its orientation, as mentioned above).

Recall that we defined the order of a potential walk, $(w; \vec{t})$ to be minus the Euler characteristic of the $\text{Graph}(w; \vec{t})$. Since, this only depends on the number of edges and vertices, and is invariant when beaded paths are replaced with single edges, we can define the order of a form or a type to be the order of any of its associated potential walk and we denote it by $\text{ord}(w; \vec{t}) = \text{ord}(\mathcal{F}(w; \vec{t})) = \text{ord}(\mathcal{T}(w; \vec{t}))$.

PROPOSITION 2.3.16. *For any positive integer r, there are only finitely many types $\mathcal{T}$ of order less than r. We denote that finite set,* $\text{Types}[r]$.

PROOF. Besides the initial vertex, which might be of degree two, all other vertices in a type are of degree at least three. Applying this to the handshaking lemma, we obtain

$$2|E_T| = \sum_{v \in V_T} \deg(v) \geq 2 + 3(|V_T| - 1) \tag{2.28}$$

and since we require that $|V_T| - |E_T| > -r$ we have $|V_T| > |E_T| - r$, which we apply to the right-hand-side of (2.28) to obtain

$$2|E_T| > 2 + 3(|E_T| - r - 1),$$

and hence,

$$|E_T| < 3r + 1$$

and hence, again using (2.28),

$$|V_T| \leq (2|E_T| + 1)/3 < 2r + 1.$$

This implies that there are finitely many graphs on which to base a type of order at most r. And for each such graph, clearly there are only finitely many ways to orient its edges, finitely many ways to order the vertices and the edges, and finitely many letterings (since the base graph, B, is fixed). □

We are going to reorganize walk sums by types and forms.

DEFINITION 2.3.17. Let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(w; \vec{t})$ be a form associated to some potential walk $(w; \vec{t})$ with underlying oriented graph F. We say that a walk in F is *consistent in* $\mathcal{F}$ if it is strictly non-backtracking closed, if it reaches every vertex and edge of F, and if it reaches them in the order specified by the orderings on $\mathcal{F}$ and it first traverses each undirected edge in the direction of its orientation.

PROPOSITION 2.3.18. *Let $(w; \vec{t})$ be a potential walk and let $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(w; \vec{t})$ be its associated form. There is a natural one-to-one correspondence between*

(1) the set of potential walk classes $[w; \vec{t}]_n$ whose form is $\mathcal{F}$, and
(2) the set of consistent walks in $\mathcal{F}$.

PROOF. This is immediate: a consistent walk uniquely defines a base walk and an equivalence class of trajectories and reciprocally. □

LEMMA 2.3.19. *Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a type, with underlying graph T and let e_1 and e_2 be two directed edges in T. Let $\mathrm{NB}(e_1, e_2, k)$ denote all non-backtracking walks of length k from e_1 to e_2 in T. For each such walk, w and each edge, $e \in E_B$, of the graph B, let $a_e(w)$ be the number of times e appears in the walk w. Then for any polynomial $Q = Q(\{a_e\}_{e \in E_T})$ in the variables a_e, then we have that*

$$\sum_{w \in \mathrm{NB}(e_1, e_2, k)} Q(a_e(w))$$

is a B-polyexponential function in k.

PROOF. This follows immediately from Corollary 2.2.17, analogous to Lemma 2.7 of [**Fri91**]. □

DEFINITION 2.3.20. Fix a walk collection, $\mathcal{W}$, a type, $\mathcal{T}$ with underlying graph T. For every form, $\mathcal{F}$, of type $\mathcal{T}$, and every $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$, let $W_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{W}, k, \vec{m})$ be the number of consistent potential walk classes, $[w; \vec{t}]_n \in \mathcal{W}(k, n)$, of form $\mathcal{F}$, that traverse each edge, $f \in E_T$, m_f times. We say that $\mathcal{W}$ is *multiplicity and length determined* if $W_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{W}, k, \vec{m})$ is just a function of $\mathcal{T}, \vec{m}, \vec{k}$ where $\vec{k} = \vec{k}(\mathcal{F})$ is the lengths of the E_T-edges in the form $\mathcal{F}$, i.e.

$$W_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{W}, k, \vec{m}) = W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k}(\mathcal{F})) \,. \tag{2.29}$$

EXAMPLE 2.3.21. If $\mathcal{W}$ is the walk collection SNBC of all strictly non-backtracking closed walks, then it is multiplicity and length determined. Furthermore, $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k}(\mathcal{F}))$ is a function of $\vec{m}$ alone. Furthermore, if the subcollection, $\mathcal{W}_0$, of SNBC of all walks, w, for which the number of edges in Graph(w) is a prime number, then it is multiplicity and length determined; in fact, more generally, for every type, $\mathcal{T}$, with underlying graph T, say one is a given a subset $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{T}) \subset \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$; let $\mathcal{W}_0$ be the walk subcollection of SNBC of walks w for which the form of the walk has vector of length, $\vec{k} = \vec{k}(\mathcal{F})$, on the E_T edges that lie in $\mathcal{K}(\mathcal{T})$, then the walk subcollection, $\mathcal{W}_0$, is multiplicity and length determined.

DEFINITION 2.3.22. We say that a walk collection, $\mathcal{W}$, *decouples*, if for every type, $\mathcal{T}$ with underlying graph T, the walk collection $\mathcal{W}$ satisfies the following property: if two forms of type $\mathcal{T}$ induce the same edge lengths on E_T, then the first form belongs to $\mathcal{W}$ if and only if the second one does too. In other words, to each type, $\mathcal{T}$, there corresponds a subset of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$ such that a form of type $\mathcal{T}$ belongs to $\mathcal{W}$ if and only if the induced vector of edge lengths on T is in that subset.

This allows us to state the main theorem of this subsection, namely an expansion of the walk sum in terms of types. Recall the notion of a B-polyexponential for a graph, B, in Definition 2.1.4

THEOREM 2.3.23. *Given a walk collection $\mathcal{W}$ that is multiplicity and length determined, and a positive integer r, we have an expansion, called the* type-form expansion of $\mathcal{W}$*:*

$$\mathrm{WalkSum}_{<r}(\mathcal{W}, k, n) = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{Types}[r]} n^{-\mathrm{ord}(\mathcal{T})} \sum_{i=0}^{r-\mathrm{ord}(\mathcal{T})} Q_{\mathcal{T},i}(k) n^{-i} + \mathrm{error}(r, n, k)$$

where the $Q_{\mathcal{T},i}$ are functions satisfying

$$Q_{\mathcal{T},i}(k) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{m}, \vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T} \\ \vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k}} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k}) P_i(\vec{k})$$

where the $P_i(\vec{k})$ are B-polyexponential functions, and $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k})$ is the function given in (2.29)*, and where the error term satisfies a bound as in Theorem 2.3.13, that is*

$$|\mathrm{error}(r, n, k)| \leq c k^{2r+2} \rho^k(H_B) n^{-r}$$

for some constant $c = c(r, B)$.

PROOF. Given a form $\mathcal{F}$, we denote by $W_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{W}, k, n)$ the number of potential walk classes, $[w; \vec{t}]_n$ of length k in the walk collection whose form is $\mathcal{F}$. Proposition 2.3.18 shows that this is the same as the number of consistent walks of length k in the from.

Given a potential walk, $(w; \vec{t})$, its associated form, $\mathcal{F}$, contains information that is equivalent to the a_e and b_v and hence, $\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}(w; \vec{t})_n$ only depends on the form. So we define $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}]_n = \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}(w; \vec{t})_n$. This allows to rewrite our walk sums as

$$\mathrm{WalkSum}(\mathcal{W}, k, n) = \sum_{\mathcal{T}} \sum_{\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}} W_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{W}, k, n) \, \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}]_n \ .$$

From this point and onward, we will only sum over types of at most some order, so we will sum over only finite types.

For a fixed type, $\mathcal{T}$, define $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}]_{n,k}$ to mean

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}]_{n,k} = \sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{T}} W_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{W},k,n)\,\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}]_n$$

Since we usually do not work with more than one walk collection at a time, we drop its mention from the notation.

For a $\vec{k} = \{k_e\}_{e\in E_T}$, let $\mathcal{T}(\vec{k})$ denote the set of all forms, $\mathcal{F}$, of type $\mathcal{T}$, such that the length of the edges of the forms is given by $\vec{k}$. For each edge $e \in E_T$ of the type, fix an integer $m_e \geq 1$, and denote $\vec{m} = \{m_e\}_{e\in E_T}$. This allows us to write

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{T}]_{n,k} = \sum_{\vec{m}\cdot\vec{k}=k} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m},\vec{k}) \sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{T}(\vec{k})} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}]_n$$

Since each of the $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}]_n$ have a $1/n$ expansion, by adding expansions, we get an asymptotic expansion

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{T}(\vec{k})} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}]_n = n^{-\operatorname{ord}(\mathcal{T})} \sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{T}(\vec{k})} \left(P_0(\mathcal{F}) + \frac{P_1(\mathcal{F})}{n} + \dots\right)$$

where

$$P_i(\mathcal{F}) = p_i(\vec{a}(\mathcal{F}),\vec{b}(\mathcal{F}))$$

where the p_i are the expansion polynomials in (2.22), and $\vec{a}(\mathcal{F})$ is the vector whose components are $a_e(\mathcal{F})$, indexed on the $e \in E_B$, representing the number of times e edges occur in $\mathcal{F}$, and similarly for $\vec{b}(\mathcal{F})$, indexed on the $f \in V_B$. Note that the vector $\vec{b}(\mathcal{F})$ is an affine linear function of the variables $\vec{a}(\mathcal{F})$ for all forms $\mathcal{F}$ of a given type $\mathcal{T}$, so we may write

$$P_i(\mathcal{F}) = P_{i,\mathcal{T}}(\vec{a}(\mathcal{F})).$$

Rearranging the sum yields

$$\mathbb{E}_n[\mathcal{T}]_{n,k} = n^{-\operatorname{ord}(\mathcal{T})}\left(Q_0(k) + Q_1(k)n^{-1} + \dots\right)$$

where

$$Q_i(k) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{m},\vec{k}\\ \vec{m}\cdot\vec{k}=k}} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m},\vec{k}) \sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{T}(\vec{k})} P_{i,\mathcal{T}}(\vec{a}(\mathcal{F})) \tag{2.30}$$

For each form, $\mathcal{F}$, of type $\mathcal{T}$, let $A_{e,f}(\mathcal{F})$ be the number of occurrences of a label $e \in E_B$ on an edge $f \in E_T$. We have that for any form $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{T}(\vec{k})$

$$a_e(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_{f\in E_T} A_{e,f}(\mathcal{F}), \tag{2.31}$$

and

$$k_f = \sum_{e\in E_B} A_{e,f}(\mathcal{F}). \tag{2.32}$$

To finish the proof of the theorem, (2.30) shows that it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{T}(\vec{k})} P_{i,\mathcal{T}}(\vec{a}(\mathcal{F}))$$

is polyexponential in k. Let us prove this; the proof makes essential use of the fact that $\mathcal{W}$ decouples.

By expanding the $P_{i,\mathcal{T}}$ is suffices to show that with $\vec{k}$ fixed we have that for any set, $\{s_e\}_{e\in E_B}$, of non-negative integers, we have

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{T}(\vec{k})}\prod_{e\in E_B} a_e^{s_e}(\mathcal{F})$$

is polyexponential in k (with bases being the eigenvalues of H_B). Using (2.31), we may further expand the powers of $a_e(\mathcal{F})$, and reduce the above sum to linear combinations of a finite number of terms

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{T}(\vec{k})}\prod_{e\in E_B}\prod_{f\in E_T} A_{e,f}^{s_{e,f}}(\mathcal{F})$$

for some non-negative integers $s_{e,f}$.

But since $\mathcal{W}$ decouples, the above equals

$$\prod_{f\in E_T}\left(\sum_{w_f\in \mathrm{NB}(e_1(f),e_2(f),k_f)}\left(\prod_{e\in E_B}\left(a_{e,f}(w_f)\right)^{s_{e,f}}\right)\right), \tag{2.33}$$

where e_1 and e_2 are determined by the lettering. However, by Lemma 2.3.19, for all $f\in E_T$ we have

$$\sum_{w_f\in \mathrm{NB}(e_1(f),e_2(f),k_f)}\left(\prod_{e\in E_B}\left(a_{e,f}(w_f)\right)^{s_{e,f}}\right) = P_f(k_f)$$

for some polyexponential functions $\{P_f(k_f)\}$. Hence the quantity in (2.33) is just

$$\prod_{f\in E_T} P_f(k_f),$$

a polyexponential function in the variable $\vec{k}$, with bases in the spectrum of H_B. □

2.4. Tangles and the Certified Trace

Tangles are low-probability events that prevent our asymptotic expansion of the expected trace to have B-Ramanujan coefficients. This was first observed by Friedman in [**Fri08**] and lead him to define a *selective trace*, which despite being quite cumbersome, showed to be effective to settle the Alon Conjecture. In our work, we simplify his selective trace and develop our certified trace in this section.

2.4.1. Tangles. We mainly use the theory developed by Friedman in [**Fri08**], however some of our terminology and methods differ. Recall the various notions of B-tangles of Definition 1.2.4 and the discussion below there; this explains that strict tangles of B are troublesome in the trace method, and—for technical ease—in this chapter our certified trace discards all walks giving rise to a B-tangle; in Section 3.3 we will only discard (certain) strict tangles, namely (B,ϵ)-tangles for various values of ϵ. Recall also Notation 1.5.1.

First, we show that if we wish to remove all tangles up to some fixed order, then there are only finitely many of them to consider.

Definition 2.4.1. For a given graph, B, and positive integer, r, let $\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}^{\min}$ be the set of elements of $\mathrm{Tangle}_{<r,B}$ that are minimal with respect to inclusion, i.e., the set of all B-tangles of order less than r that do not contain any proper subgraph that is a B-tangle.

THEOREM 2.4.2. *For any graph, B, and any positive integer, r, the set $\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}^{\min}$ is finite, and any tangle of order less than r contains at least one such minimal tangle.*

PROOF. Our proof uses the same argument as in Lemma 9.2 of [**Fri08**]. We repeat here the main points of his proof for completeness.

First note that any tangle is a finite graph, and has finitely many subgraphs, and all subgraphs without edges are not tangles. Hence any tangle contains some element of $\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}^{\min}$.

Now assume by contradiction that the set $\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}^{\min}$ is not finite. Then there must exist a type $\mathcal{T}$, with underlying graph T and an infinite sequence of tangles of type $\mathcal{T}$, which each correspond to a choice $\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$ of lengths of the edges of T. Let us refer to that infinite sequence by $\{\vec{k}_i\}_{i\geq 1}$; by passing to a subsequence, we may assume that for each edge $f \in E_T$, the corresponding sequence of lengths for this edge is either constant or tends to infinity; furthermore, there must exist at least one edge whose length sequence tends to infinity. Denote by ψ_∞ this limiting graph, where we discard the edges with length tending to infinity. Since tangles have their Hashimoto spectral radius at least $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$, the same must hold for the limiting graph and hence ψ_∞ is a B-tangle as well. Furthermore, the order of ψ_∞ is at most that of the tangle in the sequence. Hence ψ_∞ is a B-tangle. But ψ_∞ is properly contained in every element of $VLG(T, \vec{k})$, which contradicts the minimality of these graphs. □

We mention that in the above proof it is crucial that $\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}$ requires its elements, ψ, to satisfy the inequality

$$\rho(H_\psi) \geq \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$$

which is not a strict inequality. If the inequality were strict, then in the above proof we could not conclude that ψ_∞ is also a B-tangle. This, in turn, leads us to define the certified trace with strict inequality, which means that one cannot use a simple argument as above to conclude that upper sets of interest in the certified trace have a finite number of minimal elements.

2.4.2. The Occurrence of Subgraphs. The point of this subsection is to show that if $\psi \in \mathrm{Occurs}_B$ is any connected, feasible graph of order $r \geq 1$, and if $\phi\colon \psi \to B$ is an étale morphism, then for large n we have that ψ *occurs* in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, in a way consistent with its "B-structure" from ϕ, with probability

$$n^{-r}/c + O(n^{-r-1}) \tag{2.34}$$

for some integer c which we will specify below. Our proof is almost identical to the proof of Theorem 4.7 of [**Fri08**]. This theorem has two applications. The most immediate application is to give a lower bound that tangles occur in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. A much subtler application is that to estimate

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}}(G)\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\Big]$$

we shall need to estimate certified traces for those graphs which contain a tangle; in this case we will need the definitions and the methods used in this subsection to extend the methods used to prove a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion with B-Ramanujan coefficients for

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\Big]$$

to do the same for the expected certified trace multiplied by the indicator function of $\mathrm{HasTangle}_{r,B}$. This more subtle application will become clear in Section 2.5.

After we prove the theorems that we will need in this paper, we shall describe some more general facts that can be derived with similar methods; these more general facts will help put our theorems in perspective, although the more general facts will not be used here.

DEFINITION 2.4.3. Let B be a graph. By a *B-graph* we mean a morphism $\phi\colon \psi \to B$; if ϕ is understood, we will abusively refer to ψ as the B-graph.

The notion of B-graphs is very important for the following reasons.

DEFINITION 2.4.4. Let $\psi \in \mathrm{Occurs}_B$. Then ψ is isomorphic to a subgraph of at least one graph, G_0, than occurs with positive probability in $\mathcal{C}_{n_0}(B)$ for some n_0. Then any injection $\psi \to G_0$ (given by any isomorphism of ψ as a subgraph of G_0), composed with the projection of G_0 to B, gives rise to a morphism $\phi\colon \psi \to B$, i.e., gives ψ the structure of a B-graph. We say that ϕ (or, abusively, ψ) *is occurrence induced*.

We now wish to count the number of times a B-graph *occurs* in a graph, $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$. This only depends on the structure of G as a B-graph.

DEFINITION 2.4.5. Let $\phi_1\colon \psi_1 \to B$ and $\phi_2\colon \psi_2 \to B$ be two B-graphs. By a *morphism of B-graphs*, $\phi_1 \to \phi_2$, we mean a morphism $\nu\colon \psi_1 \to \psi_2$ which respects the B structure, i.e., for which $\phi_1 = \psi_2 \circ \nu$. We call the morphism an *injection* if ν is an injection. We alternatively call an injection an *occurrence* of ϕ_1 in ϕ_2, and the *number of occurrences* of ϕ_1 in ϕ_2, denoted $\mathrm{NumOccurs}(\phi_1, \phi_2)$, is the number of all such injections, ν (where two injections are distinct unless they agree on all their edge values and vertex values).

For example, in the above let ψ_1 consist of two vertices joined by some number of edges (so ψ_1 has no self-loops). Let $\tau\colon \psi_1 \to \psi_1$ be the (iso)morphism exchanging the vertices of ψ_1 and taking each directed edge to its inverse. Then if ψ_1 is given any B-graph structure, for any inclusion ν of ψ_1 into any B-graph, $\nu\tau$ is a distinct inclusion of ψ_1 into the same graph. Hence the number of occurrences of ψ_1 into any graph is even, owing to the fact that if ψ_1 is given any B-graph structure, then τ gives a nontrivial automorphism of ψ_1 as a B-graph.

This notion of automorphism gives the integer c in (2.34). Let us make this precise.

DEFINITION 2.4.6. Let $\phi\colon \psi \to B$ be a B-graph. An *automorphism of ϕ* is morphism ν from ψ to itself, as a B-graph, which is an isomorphism. The set of automorphisms becomes a group under composition, and we denote this group $\mathrm{Aut}(\phi)$.

THEOREM 2.4.7. *Let $\phi\colon \psi \to B$ be an étale morphism (hence $\psi \in \mathrm{Occurs}_B$, and occurs in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, with its B-structure, with positive probability). Then, for large n, we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\,\mathrm{NumOccurs}(\phi, B)\,] = n^{-r} + O(n^{-r-1}); \tag{2.35}$$

hence

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\,\phi \text{ occurs in } G\,] \leq n^{-r} + O(n^{-r-1}). \tag{2.36}$$

Furthermore, assume that ψ is pruned and that each connected component of ψ has order at least one. Then, for large n, the probability that ϕ occurs (at least once) as a B-subgraph of $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is, for large n, equal to

$$n^{-r}/c + O(n^{-r-1}), \tag{2.37}$$

where c is the order of the $\mathrm{Aut}(\phi)$.

Proof. The proof as essentially the same as in Theorem 4.7 in [**Fri08**]; we repeat here the argument for completeness. Let $V_\psi = \{u_1, \dots, u_s\}$. The number of occurrences of ψ in $G = G[\sigma] \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, is precisely the number of s-tuples,

$$\vec{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_s),$$

of distinct integers between 1 and n, such that there is an injection $\psi \to G$ which takes u_i to the vertex $(\phi(u_i), t_i)$ in G; equivalently, this means that for each $e \in V_\psi$ we have

$$\sigma(\phi(e))t_i = t_j,$$

where i and j are given by $u_i = \phi(t_\psi e)$ and $u_j = \phi(h_\psi e)$; i.e., for each $e \in V_\psi$, the edge, $\phi(e)$, in B, takes t_i to t_j, where u_i is the B vertex corresponding to the tail of e, and u_j is that corresponding to the head of e. For each $\vec{t}$, let $\iota_{\vec{t}}$ denote the event in $G = G[\sigma] \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ that this injection of $\psi \to G$ occurs. If a_e is the number of edges of ψ labelled with the edge $e \in E_B$, then the event $\iota_{\vec{t}}$ involves setting a_e values of the corresponding permutations which will occur with probability

$$\prod_{e \in E_B} \frac{(n-a_e)!}{n!} = n^{|E_\psi|} + O\left(n^{-|E_\psi|-1}\right).$$

Since the sum of the a_e is $|E_\psi|$. For any vertex $v \in V_B$, denote by v_b the number of vertices of ψ in the fibre of v, then the number of choices for $\iota_{\vec{t}}$ is

$$\prod_{v \in V_B} \frac{n!}{(n-b_v)!} = n^{|V_\psi|} + O\left(n^{|V_\psi|-1}\right)$$

and so we can conclude that the expected number of occurrences of ψ is

$$n^{-\operatorname{ord}(\psi)} + O\left(n^{-\operatorname{ord}(\psi)-1}\right).$$

This proves (2.35), and (2.36) is an immediate consequence.

It remains to prove (2.37), under the added assumptions on ψ. So fix a B-graph structure $\phi\colon \psi \to B$, and let

$$\mathrm{NumSubgraphs}(\psi, G)$$

denote the number of subgraphs of G that are isomorphic, as B-graphs, to ψ. We claim that

$$\mathrm{NumSubgraphs}(\psi, G) = c\ \mathrm{NumOccurs}(\psi, G).$$

Indeed, each subgraph, G', of G as a B-graph that is isomorphic to the B-graph ψ gives rise to at least c occurrences, using the automorphisms of ψ. Furthermore, if $\phi\colon \psi \to G$ is a fixed injection, with image G', then any map $\phi'\colon \psi \to G$ which has the same image as ψ gives rise to an automorphism of ψ as a B-graph given by ϕ composed with the inverse of ϕ' (restricted to G'). Hence each subgraph, G', of G isomorphic as a B-graph to ψ gives rise to exactly c occurrences of ψ in G.

Now, again, let $V_\psi = \{u_1, \dots, u_s\}$ and for a s-tuple $\vec{t}$ of distinct integers between 1 and n, let $\iota_{\vec{t}}$ denote the event that the map ι mapping u_i to the vertex at height t_i

above the matching vertex of the base graph B, is an occurrence of ψ in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$. By the preceeding paragraph, each s-tuple gives identical to $c-1$ other s-tuples; hence the s-tuples $\vec{t}$ naturally are divided into equivalence classes, each of order c; for each equivalence class choose one s-tuple $\vec{t}$. This gives us a set of equivalence class representatives, T of order n^s/c; each $\vec{t} \in T$ describes an event, $\iota_{\vec{t}}$, each of which describes an occurrence of ψ as a subgraph of $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$.

For any integer $i = 1, 2$, let $E_{\geq i} = E_{\geq i}[n]$ (respectively, $E_i = E_i[n]$) be the events that NumSubgraphs(ψ, G) is at least i (respectively, exactly i). By inclusion-exclusion we have

$$\text{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, E_{\geq 1}[n]\,] \leq \sum_{\vec{t}\in T} \text{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, \iota_{\vec{t}}\,],$$

and

$$\text{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, E_{\geq 1}[n]\,] \geq \sum_{\vec{t}\in T} \text{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, \iota_{\vec{t}}\,] - \sum_{\vec{t},\vec{t}'\in T} \text{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, \iota_{\vec{t}} \cap \iota_{\vec{t}'}\,],$$

where the sum over $\vec{t}, \vec{t}' \in T$ requires $\vec{t} \neq \vec{t}'$, and where each pair $(\vec{t}, \vec{t}')$ is counted once (not twice). By the first part of the theorem, we have

$$\sum_{\vec{t}\in T} \text{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, \iota_{\vec{t}}\,] = n^{-r}/c + O(n^{-r-1}).$$

Hence to complete the proof of the theorem, it suffices to show that

$$\sum_{\vec{t},\vec{t}'\in T} \text{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, \iota_{\vec{t}} \cap \iota_{\vec{t}'}\,] = O(n^{-r-1}). \tag{2.38}$$

For each $\vec{t}, \vec{t}' \in T$ with $\vec{t} \neq \vec{t}'$, the event $\iota_{\vec{t}} \cap \iota_{\vec{t}'}$ corresponds to two distinct copies, ψ_1, ψ_2, of the B-graph ψ in G. The union of ψ_1, ψ_2, in G is a B-graph, $\widetilde{\psi}$, which comes with injections from ψ_1 and ψ_2. Let us show that

(1) each vertex of $\widetilde{\psi}$ has degree at least two, i.e., $\widetilde{\psi}$ is pruned;
(2) each connected component of $\widetilde{\psi}$ has order at least one;
(3) $\widetilde{\psi}$ strictly contains ψ_1 (or, for that matter, ψ_2).

Item (1) follows from the fact that each vertex of $\widetilde{\psi}$ lies in ψ_1 or ψ_2, which has an injection into $\widetilde{\psi}$, and therefore has degree at least two. Item (2) follows similarly, since any vertex, v, of $\widetilde{\psi}$ is in the target of the injection from ψ_1 or from ψ_2; hence the connected component of v, in $\widetilde{\psi}$, contains, via the injections, either a connected component from ψ_1 or ψ_2 which is of order at least one. Hence any connected component of $\widetilde{\psi}$ contains a subgraph of order one, and, by Proposition 2.2.2, has order at least one. Item (3) is immediate from the fact that ψ_1 and ψ_2 are distinct B-subgraphs of G. From Items (1)–(3) it follows that Theorem 2.2.4 implies that the order of ψ is at least $r+1$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n}\Big[\, \text{NumOccurs}(\widetilde{\psi}, G)\,\Big] \leq n^{-r-1} + O(n^{-r-2}).$$

But since $\widetilde{\psi}$ has at most twice the number of vertices of ψ_1 and twice the number of edges, there are only a finite number of possible B-graphs $\widetilde{\psi}$ that arise as a union of B-graphs. It follows that

$$\sum_{\widetilde{\psi}} \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\, \text{NumOccurs}(\widetilde{\psi}, G)\,\Big] \leq O(n^{-r-1}),$$

where $\widetilde{\psi}$ ranges over all B-graphs that arise as the union of two distinct B-subgraphs in any $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$. Furthermore, we notice that any $\widetilde{\psi}$ has a finite number of subgraphs isomorphic to ψ, and hence can arise from at most a constant, C, of events $\iota_{\vec{t}} \cap \iota_{\vec{t}'}$ with $\vec{t}, \vec{t}' \in T$. Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n}\left[\sum_{\vec{t}\neq\vec{t}'} \iota_{\vec{t}} \cap \iota_{\vec{t}'}\right] \leq C \sum_{\widetilde{\psi}} \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n}\Big[\ \mathrm{NumOccurs}(\widetilde{\psi}, G)\ \Big] \leq O(n^{-r-1}),$$

which establishes (2.38), and therefore completes the proof. □

In the case where for $G = G[\sigma] \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ we have that $\sigma(e)1 = 1$ for all $e \in E_B$, then the resulting graph has Hashimoto eigenvalue $\rho(H_B)$ and is therefore a tangle. Hence there always exists a finite tangle. It follows that among all the tangles there is a smallest order that occurs.

Definition 2.4.8. For a connected graph, B, of negative Euler characteristic, we define the *fundamental order of* B, denoted $\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$, to be the smallest order of a strict tangle of B, i.e.,

$$\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B) = \min\{\mathrm{ord}(L) \mid \rho(H_L) > \rho^{1/2}(H_B)\}.$$

Proposition 2.4.9. *Let B be a fixed graph, and fix an integer $r \geq \eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$. Then there is a $C > 0$ such that for large n we have*

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\ G \textit{ contains a strict tangle of } B\ ] \geq Cn^{-\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)}.$$

Remark 2.4.10. In Section 2.5 we will extend our inclusion/exclusion further to get asymptotic expansions. As an example, we will see that for every $r > 0$ and m we have an expansion

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\ \mathrm{TF}(r, B)\ ] = 1 - q_1 n^{-1} - q_2 n^{-2} - \cdots - q_m n^{-m} + O(n^{-m-1}),$$

where the q_i are some constants with $q_i = 0$ for $i < \tau_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$.

2.4.3. Finitely Certifiable Partial Orders. In this subsection, we revisit cones in partially ordered sets. The main theorem of this subsection is Theorem 2.4.24, which shows that under some assumptions (that we call being *finitely certifiable*), some infinite sums can be dealt with using only finitely many *cone sums*. This result will be used in the following subsection to define a *certifiable trace*.

Definition 2.4.11. Let $(P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set. For $p \in P$ we define the *cone at* p to be

$$\mathrm{Cone}(p) = \{t \in P \mid t \geq p\}$$

and we define the *open cone at* p to be

$$\mathrm{Cone}^*(p) = \{t \in P \mid t > p\}$$

Definition 2.4.12. Let $(P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and let $p, q \in P$ be two distinct elements of the set. We say that p and q have a *maximum* (or *least upper bound*) if there exists an element, denoted $\max(p, q)$, such that

$$\mathrm{Cone}(p) \cap \mathrm{Cone}(q) = \mathrm{Cone}(\max(p, q))$$

We say that $(P, \leq)$ *has maximums* if every pair of distinct elements $p, q \in P$ have a maximum.

DEFINITION 2.4.13. A subset $Q \subseteq P$ of a partially ordered set $(P, \leq)$ is an *upper set* if $q \in Q$ implies that $\text{Cone}(q) \subseteq Q$. We say that $(P, \leq)$ has *finitely generated upper sets* if every upper set, $Q \subseteq P$, has a finite number of minimal elements, which we denote $\text{Minimal}(Q)$; that is, if every upper set is the union of finitely many cones.

DEFINITION 2.4.14. We say that a partially ordered set $(P, \leq)$ is *Noetherian* if every infinite sequence of upper sets in P

$$Q_1 \subseteq Q_2 \subseteq \dots$$

stabilizes, that is there exists a positive integer N such that $Q_i = Q_j$ for all $i, j \geq N$.

We make this simple observation.

THEOREM 2.4.15. *A partially ordered set is Noetherian if and only if it has finitely generated upper sets.*

PROOF. Assume that $(P, \leq)$ is Noetherian. Let $Q \subseteq P$ be an upper set and assume by contradiction that $\text{Minimal}(Q)$ is infinite. Then, there exists a countable sequence of distinct minimal elements $q_1, q_2, \dots$. Consider the sets

$$Q_i = \bigcup_{j=0}^{i} \text{Cone}(q_j)$$

Each Q_i is an upper set since it is a union of cones and clearly $Q_i \subseteq Q_{i+1}$ for all $i \geq 1$ but this sequence cannot stabilize since it is constituted of minimal elements, which contradicts $(P, \leq)$ being Noetherian.

Assume now that $(P, \leq)$ has finitely generated upper sets and consider an infinite sequence of upper sets $Q_1 \subseteq Q_2 \subseteq \dots$

Consider the set

$$Q = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} Q_i$$

Being the union of upper sets makes it an upper set as well, and hence it has a finite set of minimal elements, $\text{Minimal}(Q) = \{q_1, \dots, q_n\}$. Since there are finitely many of them, they must all belong to some Q_j for j large enough and thus have the sequence stabilize which shows that $(P, \leq)$ is Noetherian. □

DEFINITION 2.4.16. A partially ordered set $(P, \leq)$ is *finitely certifiable* if it has maximums and is Noetherian.

PROPOSITION 2.4.17. *Let $(P, \leq)$ be a finitely certifiable partially ordered set, and let $Q \subseteq P$ be an upper set of P. Then $(Q, \leq)$ is finitely certifiable.*

PROOF. Since Q is an upper set, we are guaranteed that the maximum of any two elements in Q is in Q as well. And similarly, if $Q_1 \subseteq Q_2 \subseteq \dots$ is a sequence of upper sets in Q, then since it stabilizes in P it does in Q as well. □

DEFINITION 2.4.18. Let $(P_1, \leq_1)$ and $(P_2, \leq_2)$ be two partially ordered set. Define their *product* to be the partially ordered set $(P_1 \times P_2, \leq)$ where

$$(p_1, p_2) \leq (q_1, q_2) \iff p_1 \leq_1 q_1 \quad \text{and} \quad p_2 \leq_2 q_2$$

We want to show now that the finite product of finitely certifiable partially order sets is finitely certifiable as well. For this, we first show the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.4.19. *Let $(P, \leq)$ be a Noetherian partially ordered set, and let $P' \subseteq P$ be any infinite subset of P. Then there is an infinite sequence $p_1, p_2, \ldots$ of elements of P for which*

$$p_1 < p_2 < \ldots$$

that is, for all i we have $p_i \neq p_{i+1}$ and $p_i \leq p_{i+1}$. In particular, there is no infinite subset of incomparable elements.

PROOF. Let Q be the union of the cones of the elements of the set P'. Since Q is an upper set, it has a finite set of minimal elements, Minimal(Q), which has to be a subset of P'. So there must exist at least one element of Minimal(Q), say p_1, whose cone meets infinitely many elements of P'. Let P'' be those elements of P' in the cone of p_1 that are not equal to p_1. Applying the same argument to the set P'' yields an element, p_2, in P'' whose cone meets an infinite number of elements of P'' and clearly we have that $p_1 < p_2$. Iterating this argument yields the desired infinite sequence. □

THEOREM 2.4.20. *Using the notation of Definition 2.4.18, the product of two finitely certifiable partially ordered sets is finitely certifiable.*

PROOF. Let Q be an upper set of $(P, \leq)$ and assume by contradiction that the set Minimal(Q) is infinite. This implies that there is an infinite sequence

$$(p_1^1, p_2^1), (p_1^2, p_2^2), (p_1^3, p_2^3), \ldots$$

of distinct elements of Minimal(Q). Then we can find an infinite sequence of distinct elements in either P_1 or P_2. Without loss of generality, let us assume that the set

$$P' = \{p_1^1, p_1^2, \ldots\} \subseteq P_1$$

is infinite and that its element are all distinct, that is, for all $i \neq j$ we have $p_1^i \neq p_1^j$. Passing to a subsequence and using Lemma 2.4.19, we can assume without loss of generality that we have

$$p_1^1 < p_1^2 < p_1^3 < \ldots$$

But then we can conclude that for each $i \neq j$ we have $p_2^i \neq p_2^j$ or else one of (p_1^i, p_2^i) and (p_1^i, p_2^j) would not be minimal. Hence the set $\{p_2^1, p_2^2, \ldots\} \subseteq P_2$ is an infinite set. Using Lemma 2.4.19 again and passing to a subsequence, we can assume without loss of generality that we have

$$p_2^{\tau(1)} < p_2^{\tau(2)} < p_2^{\tau(3)} < \ldots$$

for some permutation, τ, of the integers. But this is impossible: consider j_0 such that $\tau(j_0) = 1$ then for any $j > j_0$ we have

$$p_2^1 = p_2^{\tau(j_0)} < p_2^{\tau(j)}$$

and hence

$$(p_1^1, p_2^1) < (p_1^{\tau(j)}, p_2^{\tau(j)})$$

which contradicts the minimality of $(p_1^{\tau(j)}, p_2^{\tau(j)})$. □

Our main interest in this paper consists of the following example.

PROPOSITION 2.4.21. *Let $\mathbb{Z}^t_{\geq 0}$ be the set of non-negatives t-tuples and equip it with the partial order*

$$(a_1, \ldots, a_t) \leq (b_1, \ldots, b_t) \iff a_i \leq b_i \quad \forall i$$

then this partially ordered set is finitely certifiable.

PROOF. Using Theorem 2.4.20, we simply need to show that the partially ordered set $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \leq)$ is finitely certifiable. The maximum of two elements is just the usual maximum. If $U \subset \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is an upper set, then it contains some nonzero element, a, and therefore has a minimum element a'; in this case a' is the unique minimal element. Hence $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is finitely certifiable, and hence also $\mathbb{Z}^t_{\geq 0}$. □

We now study functions on partially ordered sets and aim to conclude that when they are finitely certifiable, functions can be expressed as finite linear combinations.

DEFINITION 2.4.22. Let $(P, \leq)$ be a partially ordered set and let $L^1(P)$ denote the set of functions $f\colon P \to \mathbb{C}$ for which

$$\|f\|_1 = \sum_{p \in P} |f(p)|$$

is finite. For each function $f \in L^1(P)$ and element $p \in P$ define the *cone sum of f at p* to be

$$\widehat{f}(p) = \sum_{q \in \mathrm{Cone}(p)} f(q)$$

We now state an inclusion-exclusion theorem, giving Möbius-type coefficients.

THEOREM 2.4.23. *Let $(P, \leq)$ be a finitely certifiable partially ordered set and let $f \in L^1(P)$. Then for all $p \in P$, there are integers $\mu(p)$ for which*

(1) $\mu(p) = 0$ for all but finitely many elements, $p \in P$, and
(2) for any function $f \in L^1(P)$ we have

$$\sum_{p \in P} f(p) = \sum_{p \in P} \mu(p) \widehat{f}(p)$$

Specifically, $\mu(p)$ is the sum of the number of times p appears as the maximum of an odd number of minimal points of P, minus the number of times it appears as the maximum of an even (non-zero) number of minimal points.

PROOF. For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we will show that

$$\left| \sum_{p \in P} f(p) - \sum_{p \in P} \mu(p) \widehat{f}(p) \right| < \varepsilon$$

for some coefficients, $\mu(p)$, that we will describe below.

We begin by replacing f by a function which is very close but has the advantage of having a finite support, which we need in order to rearrange what would otherwise be infinite sums. Since

$$\sum_{p \in P} |f(p)|$$

is finite, there exists a function f_ε of finite support such that $\|f - f_\varepsilon\|_1 < \varepsilon$. Now, we observe that $|\widehat{f}(q) - \widehat{f}_\varepsilon(q)| < \varepsilon$, since

$$|\widehat{f}(q) - \widehat{f}_\varepsilon(q)| \leq \sum_{p \in \mathrm{Cone}(q)} |f(p) - f_\varepsilon(p)| \leq \|f - f_\varepsilon\|_1 < \varepsilon$$

Now since f_ε has a finite support, we can use the finite inclusion-exclusion principle on the cones of the minimal elements of P to obtain

$$\sum_{p\in P} f\varepsilon(p) = \sum_{1\leq i_1\leq n} \widehat{f_\varepsilon}(p_{i_1}) - \sum_{1\leq i_1<i_2\leq n} \widehat{f_\varepsilon}(\max(p_{i_1},p_{i_2})) + \dots \\ + (-1)^{n+1} \sum_{1\leq i_1<\dots<i_n\leq n} \widehat{f_\varepsilon}(\max(p_{i_1},\dots,p_{i_n}))$$

This sum being finite, we can rearrange it and write as

$$\sum_{p\in P} \mu(p)\widehat{f_\varepsilon}(p)$$

where μ is a function on P whose support is included in the set of all possible combinations of maximums of minimal elements of P, that is

$$\text{support}(\mu) \subseteq \{\max(p_{i_1},\dots,p_{i_k}) \mid k=1,\dots,n \quad i_j \in \{1,\dots,n\}\}$$

As claimed in the theorem's statement, one can see that $\mu(p)$ is the sum of the number of times p appears as the maximum of an odd number of minimal points of P, minus the number of times it appears as the maximum of an even (non-zero) number of minimal points.

We now have

$$\left|\sum_{p\in P} f(p) - \sum_{p\in P} \mu(p)\widehat{f}(p)\right| \leq \left|\sum_{p\in P} f(p) - f_\varepsilon(p)\right| + \left|\sum_{p\in P} f_\varepsilon(p) - \mu(p)\widehat{f_\varepsilon}(p)\right| \\ + \left|\sum_{p\in P} \mu(p)\widehat{f_\varepsilon}(p) - \mu(p)\widehat{f}(p)\right| \\ \leq \|f-f_\varepsilon\|_1 + 0 + \varepsilon \sum_{p\in P} |\mu(p)| < C\varepsilon$$

For some fixed constant C which only depends on P and thus concludes the proof. □

This allows to state the main theorem of this subsection. It follows immediately from the above theorems and its application suggests a very simple modified trace that we will describe in the next subsection.

THEOREM 2.4.24. *Let $(P,\leq)$ be a finitely certified partially ordered set, let Q be an upper set of P and let $f \in L^1(P)$. Then there exists "Möbius coefficients," $\mu_Q\colon Q\to\mathbb{Z}$, such that*

$$\sum_{q\in Q} f(q) = \sum_{q\in Q} \mu(q)\widehat{f}(q)$$

where $\mu_Q(q)=0$ for all but finitely many elements of Q.

PROOF. This is immediate, applying Theorem 2.4.23 to Q itself since Proposition 2.4.17 guarantees it is a finitely certifiable partially ordered set itself. □

2.4.4. The Certified Trace.

DEFINITION 2.4.25. Consider the collection of sets

$$\text{CertSNBC} = \{\text{CertSNBC}(k,n)\}_{k,n\geq 1}$$

defined by

$$\text{CertSNBC}(k,n) = \{(w;\vec{t}) \in \text{SNBC}(k,n) \mid \rho_H(\text{Graph}(w;\vec{t})) < \rho^{1/2}(H_B)\}$$

that is, all the potential walks that are closed, strictly non-backtracking, of order less than r and which are not tangles.

PROPOSITION 2.4.26. *The collection of sets* CertSNBC *is a walk collection.*

PROOF. This is immediate since both the Hashimoto spectral radius is preserved up to symmetry and size increase. □

DEFINITION 2.4.27. We define the *kth certified trace of size n*, $\text{CertTr}(G,k)$, of a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ to be the (k,n)-modified trace associated to CertSNBC and we write its associated walk sum as

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{CertTr}(G,k)] = \text{WalkSum}(\text{CertSNBC}(k,n))$$

and for any positive integer, $r \geq 1$, we define the *truncated certified trace* to be the associated truncated walk sum

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\text{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)] = \text{WalkSum}_{<r}(\text{CertSNBC}(k,n))$$

which only sums certified potential walks of order less than r.

PROPOSITION 2.4.28. *Let T be the graph of a type $\mathcal{T}$. Then the set of vectors*

$$U = \{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T} \mid \text{VLG}(T,\vec{k}\,) \notin \text{Tangle}_B\}$$

is an upper set of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$.

PROOF. It suffices to show that for any $\vec{k} \leq \vec{k}'$, then $\vec{k} \in U$ implies that $\vec{k}' \in U$. So fix a $\vec{k} \leq \vec{k}'$ with $\vec{k} \in U$. We will show that $\vec{k}' \in U$.

By definition, T is a connected graph. Fix a vertex, $v \in T$. For any $\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$, v can also be viewed as a vertex in $\text{VLG}(T,\vec{k})$. Since T is connected, we have that

$$\mu_1\big(\text{VLG}(T,\vec{k})\big) = \lambda_1\big(\text{VLG}(\text{Line}(T),\text{Line}(\vec{k})\big),$$

where $\text{Line}(T)$ is the oriented line graph of T, and $\text{Line}(\vec{k})$ is the vector of edge lengths on $\text{Line}(T)$ which to an edge, (e,e'), in $\text{Line}(T)$ (so $e,e' \in E_T$) assigns the length $k(e)$. Since $\vec{k} \leq \vec{k}'$, then

$$\text{Line}(\vec{k}) \leq \text{Line}(\vec{k}').$$

Now we apply Proposition 1.1.20 to conclude that

$$\mu_1\big(\text{VLG}(T,\vec{k}')\big) \leq \mu_1\big(\text{VLG}(T,\vec{k})\big).$$

Since $\vec{k} \in U$, we have

$$\mu_1\big(\text{VLG}(T,\vec{k})\big) < \rho^{1/2}(H_B),$$

and hence

$$\mu_1\big(\text{VLG}(T,\vec{k}')\big) < \rho^{1/2}(H_B).$$

It follows that $\vec{k}' \in U$. □

COROLLARY 2.4.29. *For each type, $\mathcal{T}$, there is a finite number of* tangle certificates*, that is, a finite family of vectors, $\vec{k}_{0,1}, \ldots, \vec{k}_{0,s}$ such that*

$$\mathrm{VLG}(T, \vec{k}) \notin \mathrm{Tangle}_B \iff \vec{k} \geq \vec{k}_{0,i} \text{ for some } i = 1, \ldots, s$$

where T is the underlying graph of the type $\mathcal{T}$

We now have all the elements required to state the main theorem of this subsection.

THEOREM 2.4.30. *Consider the type-form expansion described in Theorem 2.3.23. The walk sum coefficients of the certified trace can be written as a finite linear combination of functions of the form*

$$\mathrm{Term}[\mathcal{T}, \vec{k}_0, r](k) = \sum_{\vec{k} \geq \vec{k}_0} \sum_{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k}) P_i(\vec{k})$$

where $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k})$ counts the number of strictly non-backtracking walks in the type $\mathcal{T}$ with edge lengths defined by $\vec{k}$ and that traverses each edge $f \in E_T$ of the type m_f times; and $P_i(\vec{k})$ is a polyexponential function.

PROOF. Since CertSNBC is clearly multiplicity and length determined, we can apply Theorem 2.3.23 to obtain an expansion

$$\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(\mathcal{W}, k, n) = \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathrm{Types}[r]} n^{-\mathrm{ord}(\mathcal{T})} \sum_{i=0}^{r - \mathrm{ord}(\mathcal{T})} Q_{\mathcal{T},i}(k) n^{-i} + \mathrm{error}(r, n, k)$$

where the $Q_{\mathcal{T},i}$ are functions satisfying

$$Q_{\mathcal{T},i}(k) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{m}, \vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T} \\ \vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k}} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k}) P_i(\vec{k})$$

where the $P_i(\vec{k})$ are B-polyexponential functions, and with error term

$$|\mathrm{error}(r, n, k)| \leq c k^{2r+2} \rho(H_B)^k n^{-r}$$

Now, we simply apply Theorem 2.4.24 to the upper set

$$\{\vec{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{|E_T|} \mid \mathrm{VLG}(T, \vec{k}) \notin \mathrm{Tangle}_B\}$$

and obtain that there are finitely many certificates, $\vec{k}_0$, such that we can rewrite the $Q_{\mathcal{T},i}(k)$ as a finite linear combination of cone sums of the form

$$\mathrm{Term}[\mathcal{T}, \vec{k}_0, r](k) = \sum_{\vec{k} \geq \vec{k}_0} \sum_{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k}) P_i(\vec{k})$$

□

2.4.5. Asymptotic Expansions and a Proof of Theorem 2.1.2. In this section we give the somewhat technical estimates to establish that terms in Theorem 2.4.30 are B-Ramanujan. After proving this, we collect the various theorems proven which immediately establish Theorem 2.1.2.

THEOREM 2.4.31. *The terms of the form*

$$\text{Term}[\mathcal{T}, \vec{k}_0, r](k) = \sum_{\vec{k} \geq \vec{k}_0} \sum_{\vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) P_i(\vec{k}\,) \tag{2.39}$$

given in Theorem 2.4.30 are B-Ramanujan functions. Hence the r-th truncated certified trace admits a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r with B-Ramanujan coefficients.

These types of sums are similar to those in Theorem 8.2 of [**Fri08**] and Theorem 2.18 of [**Fri91**]. In both those theorems, a key idea is to divide the vector $\vec{m}$ by those components equal to 1 and those components that are at least 2. Here we notice that by a similar division, into components at most M and components at least $M+1$, for a fixed value of M, we greatly simplify the computations. The role of tangles on the asymptotic expansion becomes clear as well.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4.31. Fix an integer M such that $M \geq 1/\varepsilon$ and fix a partition of the edges of the type

$$E_T = E_{T,1} \amalg E_{T,2}$$

We call the edges in $E_{T,1}$ the *short* and the edges in $E_{T,2}$ *long*. We write $\vec{m} \in ML(k, M) = ML(k, M, E_{T,1}, E_{T,2})$ if

(1) $\vec{m} \in \{\vec{m} \mid \vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k,\ \vec{k} \geq \vec{k}_0, \text{ for } \vec{k}_0 \text{ a certificate}\}$,
(2) $m_f \leq M$ if $f \in E_{T,1}$,
(3) $m_f \geq M+1$ if $f \in E_{T,2}$.

and so we can rewrite equation (2.39) as

$$\text{Term}[\mathcal{T}, \vec{k}_0, r](k) = \sum_{E_{T,1} \amalg E_{T,2} = E_T} \sum_{(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) \in ML(k, M, E_{T,1}, E_{T,2})} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}\,) q_i(\vec{k}\,)$$

For each $(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) \in ML(k, M)$ define

$$K_1(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) = \sum_{f \in E_{T,1}} m_f k_f \quad \text{and} \quad K_2(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) = \sum_{f \in E_{T,2}} m_f k_f \tag{2.40}$$

and so it follows that $K_1(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) + K_2(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) = k$ for all $(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) \in ML(k, M)$. Since there are finitely many partitions of the edges of the type, we only need to consider expressions of the form

$$\text{Term}(k, E_{T,1}, E_{T,2}) = \sum_{(\vec{m}, \vec{k}\,) \in ML(k, M)} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}\,) q_i(\vec{k}\,) \tag{2.41}$$

and show that they are B-Ramanujan functions, which would prove our Theorem 2.4.31

LEMMA 2.4.32. *Let $\mathcal{T} \in \text{Types}[r]$ be a type of order less than r and let $(E_{T,1}, E_{T,2})$ be a partition of the edges of the type. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and integer $M \geq 1/\varepsilon$ we have that the function $\text{Term}(k, E_{T,1}, E_{T,2})$, as described above, is B-Ramanujan.*

PROOF. We distinguish two cases for this proof:

(1) When $E_{T,1} = \emptyset$
(2) When $E_{T,1} \neq \emptyset$

So, let us start with the first case: we consider the term in (2.41), in the case where $E_{T,1} = \emptyset$ and $E_{T,2} = E_T$. For every $(\vec{m}, \vec{k}) \in ML(k, M)$ we have

$$W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}) \leq Ck^C \rho(H_B)^{k/2},$$

since each walk in $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m})$ gives a walk of length k in $\mathrm{Path}(T, \vec{k})$, which corresponds to walk of length at most k in $\mathrm{Path}(T, \vec{k}^0)$, and the number of such walks is bounded by $Ck^C \rho(H_B)^{k/2}$ since the largest Hashimoto eigenvalue of $\mathrm{Path}(T, \vec{k}^0)$ is at most $\rho(H_B)^{-1/2}$.

Now we note the following crude bound.

LEMMA 2.4.33. *The number of pairs $(\vec{m}, \vec{k})$ for which $\vec{m}, \vec{k} \geq \vec{1}$ and $\vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k$ is at most*

$$\binom{k + |E_T| - 1}{|E_T| - 1} k^{|E_T|}.$$

PROOF. For each $(\vec{m}, \vec{k})$, set $s_f = m_f k_k$ for each $f \in E_T$. Then the sum of the s_f is k, and there are $\binom{k+|E_T|-1}{|E_T|-1}$ ways of representing k as the sum of integers $\{s_f\}_{f \in E_T}$ with $s_f \geq 0$. Furthermore, each s_f can be represented as at most k products $m_f k_f$, with $m_f, k_f \geq 1$. □

Finally, we notice that if $m_f \geq M + 1$ for all $f \in E_T$, and $\vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k$, then we have

$$S = \sum_{f \in E_T} k_f \leq k/(M+1),$$

and so

$$P(\vec{k}) \leq \prod_{f \in E_T} \rho(H_B)^{k_f} C k_f^C \leq C' k^{C'} \rho(H_B)^{\sum_{f \in E_T} k_f} \leq C' k^{C'} \rho(H_B)^{k/(M+1)}.$$

It follows that, in the notation of (2.41), we have

$$|\mathrm{Term}(\emptyset, E_T)| \leq |ML(k, M, \emptyset, E_T)| \max_{\vec{m} \in ML(k, M\emptyset, E_T)} |W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m})| \max_{\vec{k} \in ML(k, M, \emptyset, E_T)} P(\vec{k})$$

$$\leq Ck^C \ \rho(H_B)^{k/2} Ck^C \ C' k^{C'} \rho(H_B)^{(k/2)+(k/(M+1))}.$$

$$\leq C'' k^{C''} \rho(H_B)^{k((1/2)+\varepsilon)}.$$

It follows that for any $\widetilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ and some (new) constant, C, and sufficiently large M we have

$$|\mathrm{Term}(\emptyset, E_T)| \leq Ck^C (d - 1 + \widetilde{\varepsilon})^{k/2}.$$

It suffices to give a similar bound for $\mathrm{Term}(E_{T,1}, E_{T,2})$ for the other partitions of E_T as $E_{T,1} \amalg E_{T,2}$. But this case alone shows how the certification seems essential, in that if $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m})$ could be as large as $(d - 1 + \delta)^{k/2}$ for some fixed $\delta > 0$, we could not give a good enough bound just on $\mathrm{Term}(\emptyset, E_T)$.

A Specialized Bound For $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m})$. To bound $\mathrm{Term}(E_{T,1}, E_{T,2})$ when $E_{T,1}$ is not empty, we will use Theorem 2.2.10. To do so we would like to bound $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m})$ for each $(\vec{m}, \vec{k}) \in ML(k, M)$, in terms of K_1, K_2 given by (2.40). Specifically, we which for m_f fixed for $f \in E_{T,1}$, gives a bound for $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m})$ in terms of the exponent K_2, rather than k. Here is what we will need.

LEMMA 2.4.34. *Fix $\mathcal{T}, \vec{k}^0, M$, and a partition $E_{T,1} \amalg E_{T_2}$ of E_T. Then there exists a constant, C, for which*

$$W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}) \leq C K_2^C \rho(H_B)^{K_2/2}$$

provided that $(\vec{m}, \vec{k}) \in ML(k, M, E_{T,1}, E_{T,2})$

PROOF. Consider a walk, w, in $\mathcal{T}$. Such a walk traverses a bounded number of edges in $E_{T,1}$, namely at most $B = M|E_{T,1}|$ edges. Let w^0 be the walk in $E_{T,2}$ edges taken before the first $E_{T,1}$ edge is taken in w, and for $1 \leq i \leq B$, let w^i be the walk taken between the i-th and $(i+1)$-th occurrence of an $E_{T,1}$ edge in w. (Some of the w^i will be empty when w traverses two or more $E_{T,1}$ edges in a row; and some of the w^i will be empty if w traverses fewer than B edges of $E_{T,1}$.) Let K_2^i denote the number of edges traversed in w^i when transferred to the graph $\mathrm{Path}(T, \vec{k})$. First, we have

$$K_2^0 + K_2^1 + \cdots + K_2^B = K_2.$$

Second, for fixed K_2^i, the number of walks in $\mathrm{Path}(T, \vec{k})$ of length at most K_2^i is bounded by

$$C(K_2^i)^C \rho(H_B)^{K_2^i/2} \tag{2.42}$$

Finally, between w^i and w^{i+1}, we traverse one edge of $E_{T,1}$, which can happen in at most a constant number of ways (namely one less than the maximum degree of T). It follows that

$$W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}) \leq \sum_{\substack{K_2^i \geq 0 \\ K_2^0 + \cdots + K_2^B = k}} C^B \prod_{i=0}^{B} [C(K_2^i)^C \rho(H_B)^{K_2^i/2}], \tag{2.43}$$

where the C^B term reflects the B choices of $E_{T,1}$ element, and the product over i comes from the (2.42). We bound the right-hand-side of (2.43) as follows:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{B} [C(K_2^i)^C \rho(H_B)^{K_2^i/2}] \leq \left(CK_2^C\right)^{B+1} \rho(H_B)^{(K_2^0 + \cdots + K_2^B)/2} \leq C' K_2^{C'} \rho(H_B)^{K_2/2}.$$

Finally the number of ways of writing K_2 as a sum of the K_2^i, i.e., $B+1$ non-negative integers is exactly $\binom{K_2+B}{B+1}$, a polynomial in K_2. Hence (2.43) yields

$$W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}) \leq \binom{K_2 + B}{B+1} C' K_2^{C'} \rho(H_B)^{K_2/2}.$$

□

It remains to show an asymptotic expansion for $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}) P(\vec{k})$ for B-Ramanujan P. Let us partition $\vec{m}$ and $\vec{k}$ by the $E_{T,1} \amalg E_{T,2}$ partition; namely, let

$$\vec{k}^i = \{k_f\}_{f \in E_{T,i}},$$

so we may write $\vec{k} = (\vec{k}^1, \vec{k}^2)$, and similarly $\vec{m} = (\vec{m}^1, \vec{m}^2)$. It suffices to show that for $P_1(\vec{k}^1)$ and $P_2(\vec{k}^2)$ polyexponentials, we have that

$$g(E_{T,1}, E_{T,2}, k) = \sum_{(\vec{m}, \vec{k}) \in ML(k, M, E_{T,1}, E_{T,2})} W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m}) P_1(\vec{k}^1) P_2(\vec{k}^2)$$

is B-Ramanujan. So for any integer, K_1, and any $\vec{m}^1 \in \{1,\dots,M\}^{E_{T,1}}$, let

$$Q_1(K_1;\vec{m}^1) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{m}^1\cdot\vec{k}^1=K_1\\ \vec{m}^1\geq\vec{1},\ \vec{k}^1\geq\vec{k}^{1,0}}} P_1(\vec{k}^1),$$

and

$$Q_2(K_2) = \sum_{\substack{\vec{m}^2\cdot\vec{k}^2=K_2\\ \vec{m}^2\geq\vec{1},\ \vec{k}^2\geq\vec{k}^{2,0}}} W_{\mathcal{T}}((\vec{m}^1,\vec{m}^2))P_2(\vec{k}^2).$$

We have Q_1 is a B-Ramanujan, and Q_2 is of growth at most $(d-1+\varepsilon)^{1/2}$. Hence, for each $\vec{m}^1 \in \{1,\dots,M\}^{E_{T,1}}$ we have $Q_1 * Q_2$ is B-Ramanujan. Hence the sum over all $\vec{m}^1$ is B-Ramanujan.

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.4.32. □

Since each term in Theorem 2.4.31 is a finite sum of terms in Lemma 2.4.32, and clearly a finite sum of B-Ramanujan functions is again B-Ramanujan, we conclude Theorem 2.4.31. □

2.5. Certified Traces In Graphs With Tangles and The Proof of Theorems 2.1.3 and 2.1.1

In this section we widen the notion of a *type* to prove Theorem 2.1.3, theorem, based on the ideas of Section 9 of [**Fri08**]. We then give the short argument to prove Theorem 2.1.1. Actually, we will prove the following more general form of Theorem 2.1.3.

THEOREM 2.5.1. *Let B be any connected graph of positive order without half-loops. Let Ψ be any finite collection of connected, pruned, B-graphs, each of order at least one. Let $I_\Psi(G)$ be the function that is one or zero according to whether or not G has a subgraph isomorphic to an element of Ψ. Then for any positive integer, r, we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\ I_\Psi(G)\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\ ]$$

has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion with the usual error term and with B-Ramanujan coefficients.

We remark that in the above theorem, we can replace the condition that each $\psi \in \Psi$ be pruned by the condition that each connected component of each ψ has order at least one; however, assuming that each ψ is pruned simplifies the argument, and is sufficient for our purposes.

This section also contains a related theorem, Theorem 2.5.2 below, which will be needed to complete the proof of Theorem 0.2.6; it is a consequence of the methods of this section.

THEOREM 2.5.2. *Let B be any connected graph of positive order without half-loops. Let Ψ be any finite collection of connected, pruned, B-graphs, each of order at least one. Let $I_\Psi(G)$ be the function that is one or zero according to whether or not G has a subgraph isomorphic to an element of Ψ. Then for any positive integer, r, we have that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[I_\Psi(G)] = p_1n^{-1} + p_2n^{-2} + \cdots + p_{r-1}n^{1-r} + O(n^{-r})$$

for some constants p_i.

At this point we simply adapt the proof of Theorem 9.3 of [**Fri08**] to this situation. The first idea is that we want to develop the theory of walk-sums and asymptotic expansion which allows us to condition upon the existence of a certain subgraph occurring in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$. The conditioned walk-sums will then be used to express, via inclusion/exclusion, the indicator function, $I_\Psi(G)$, in Theorems 2.5.1 and 2.5.2. Let us give some precise terms and prove the basic estimates.

2.5.1. Potential Graph Specializations.

DEFINITION 2.5.3. A *potential graph specialization* is a pair, (Ω, ξ), where Ω is a B-graph, and $\xi\colon V_\Omega \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$ is a map. We may view (Ω, ξ) as an event in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, namely the event that Ω occurs in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ in a way so that the map on vertices of the occurrence is given by ξ. We say that a potential graph specialization is *feasible* if it is an event of positive probability in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$.

Alternatively, we may describe the event (Ω, ξ), as the set of $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for which the following is true: for each $e \in E_\Omega$, let $e_B \in E_B$ be the B-edge corresponding to e in its structure as a B-graph; let the tail of e be v_1, and its head v_2, and let $v_{1,B}$ and $v_{2,B}$ be the B-vertices corresponding to v_1 and v_2 respectively; the event (Ω, ξ) is the event that for all $e \in E_\Omega$, and ensuing $e_B, v_1, v_2, v_{1,B}, v_{2,B}$ as above, the (unique) edge over e_B in G with tail $(v_{1,B}, \xi(v_1))$ must have its head being $(v_{2,B}, \xi(v_2))$.

Note that a potential graph specialization is equivalent to an event $\iota_{\vec{t}}$ in the proof of Theorem 2.4.7; the above definition and notation is a bit better suited to the theorems in this section and their proofs.

DEFINITION 2.5.4. Given a potential walk, $(w; \vec{t})$, and a potential graph specialization, (Ω, ξ), we define

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\ (w; \vec{t}), (\Omega, \xi)\ \big]$$

to be the probability that events $(w; \vec{t})$ and (Ω, ξ) both occur in $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, i.e., both (Ω, ξ) and the walk $(w; \vec{t})$ occur in G.

In effect, both $(w; \vec{t})$ and (Ω, ξ), if they occur, describe subgraphs of G. It may well happen that the subgraphs of G described by $(w; \vec{t})$ and (Ω, ξ) intersect on some of their vertices and edges; it may also happen that $(w\ \vec{t})$ and (Ω, ξ) describe contradictory information in G and hence can never occur together.

DEFINITION 2.5.5. Given a potential walk, $(w; \vec{t})$, and a potential graph specialization, (Ω, ξ), we may view $(\vec{t}, \xi)$ as two maps (from the vertices of w and the vertices of Ω) to $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. We say that $(\vec{t}', \xi')$ is *equivalent* to $(\vec{t}, \xi)$ if they differ by a permutation of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, i.e., there is a permutation $\pi \in S_n$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ for which $\vec{t}' = \pi \circ \vec{t}$ and $\xi' = \pi \circ \xi$. (If $\pi \in S_n$ fixes all elements of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ in the range of $\vec{t}$ and ξ then we get the same vertex maps with $\vec{t}' = \pi \circ \vec{t}$ and $\xi' = \pi \circ \xi$, and we consider $(\vec{t}', \xi')$ to be the same as $(\vec{t}, \xi)$.) We define

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}[(w; \vec{t}), (\Omega, \xi)]_n$$

to be the sum

$$\sum_{(\vec{t}', \xi') \sim (\vec{t}, \xi)} \mathrm{Prob}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\ (w; \vec{t}'), (\Omega, \xi')\ \big],$$

summing over all $(\vec{t}', \xi')$ equivalent to $(\vec{t}, \xi)$ (analogous to Definition 2.3.7).

Clearly Proposition 2.3.8 generalizes as follows.

PROPOSITION 2.5.6. *Let B be a graph without half-loops. Given a potential walk, $(w;\vec{t})$, and a potential graph specialization, (Ω,ξ), we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}[(w;\vec{t}),(\Omega,\xi)]_n$$

is zero if $\vec{t}$ and ξ imply contradictory values for the permutation over any edge, $e\in E_B$, in $G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, and otherwise equals

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}(w;\vec{t})_n=\prod_{v\in V_B}\frac{n!}{(n-b_v)!}\prod_{e\in E_B}\frac{(n-a_e)!}{n!}, \tag{2.44}$$

where for $v\in V_B$, b_v describes the number of vertices over B in $\vec{t}\cup\xi$, meaning that vertices where $\vec{t}$ and ξ agree are counted once, and where for $e\in E_B$, a_e counts the number of edges over e occurring in the union of the subgraphs determined by $(w;\vec{t})$ and (Ω,ξ).

Again, if B has half-loops with n even, then each half-loop gives rise to an involution rather than a general permutation, and we can replace the factorials for a_e by odd factorials, as described in Proposition 2.3.8.

For the rest of this section we need to do two things. First, we will show that in Theorems 2.5.1 and 2.5.2, using a "Möbius function," one can replace the function $I_\Psi(G)$ by a linear combination of sums of the form

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}[(w;\vec{t}),(\Omega,\xi)]_n$$

where Ω ranges over a finite set of graphs, and the $(w;\vec{t})$ has at most a certain order. Then we will take the union of the subgraphs determined by $(w;\vec{t})$ and (Ω,ξ), and divide them into *generalized types*, which consist of a finite number of fixed edges and vertices via (Ω,ξ), plus the remaining edges traversed by $(w;\vec{t})$, with the union of the subgraphs divided into a simple generalization of the notion of a type. Then we need to check most all of the results in Sections 2.3 and 2.4 carry over to our generalized notion of types, and to the sum of

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}[(w;\vec{t}),(\Omega,\xi)]_n$$

over all $(w;\vec{t})$ of that type. Let us begin with the Möbius function argument.

DEFINITION 2.5.7. Let B be a graph. For a collection B-graphs, Ψ, we say that a *set of derived graphs of* Ψ, denoted Ψ^+, is the set B-graphs in Occurs_B which can be expressed as the finite union of graphs, each isomorphic to an element of Ψ; furthermore we insist that Ψ^+ contain exactly one graph in each isomorphism class of B-graphs. We let $\Psi^+_{<r}$ be those elements of Ψ^+ of order less than r.

If Ψ is a finite collection of finite graphs, then Ψ^+ always exists (without the axiom of choice); we will choose some arbitrary Ψ^+ for each Ψ we consider. We emphasize that in defining Ψ^+, it is simplest to work with one representative in each isomorphism class of B-graphs, since in each isomorphism class there are infinitely many graphs.

THEOREM 2.5.8. *Let Ψ be a nonempty, finite collection of pruned, connected, non-empty graphs of order at least one. For any r, $\Psi^+_{<r}$ is finite.*

PROOF. Let $\Psi[i]$ denote the subset of Ψ^+ that can be obtained as a union of $i \geq 1$ copies of the B-graphs in Ψ (i.e., the union of i of its subgraphs, each isomorphic to an element of Ψ), but not fewer than i copies. Then $\Psi[1]$ is just a set of (isomorphism) representatives of the set of B-graphs, Ψ. We remark that since any element in Ψ^+ can be obtained as a finite union of elements of Ψ, each element of Ψ^+ can be written as a minimal number of copies of elements of Ψ, and hence each element of Ψ^+ lies in $\Psi[i]$ for exactly one integer $i \geq 1$. We will now establish a number of properties of $\Psi[i]$ for all i, and these properties will prove the theorem.

First note that every vertex, v, in a graph of $\psi \in \Psi^+$ lies in a copy of (i.e., subgraph of ψ isomorphic to) a graph of Ψ, and hence v is of degree at least two in ψ. Hence every element of Ψ^+ is pruned. Now if $\psi \in \Psi^+$, then any connected component of ψ contains at least one copy of an element of Ψ; hence, by Theorem 2.2.3, any connected component of ψ has order at least one.

Second, we claim that for any graph $\psi \in \Psi[i]$, the order of ψ is at least i. We can prove this by induction on i. Indeed, this holds for $i = 1$, since $\Psi[1] = \Psi$. Assuming this holds for some value of i, then any $\psi \in \Psi[i+1]$ is the union of the B-graphs $\psi' \in \Psi[i]$ plus one copy of an element of Ψ, and, by definition, the inclusion of ψ' in ψ is not surjective. Since the order of ψ' is, by induction, at least i, Theorem 2.2.4 implies that the order of ψ is strictly larger than that of ψ', i.e., at least $i+1$. Hence the order of any element of $\Psi[i+1]$ is at least $i+1$. Therefore, by induction, the order of any element of $\Psi[i]$ is at least i.

Third, we claim that the set $\Psi[i]$ is finite for each i; again we use induction on i. Indeed, this is true for $i = 1$, since $\Psi[1] = \Psi$. Let us assume that $\Psi[i]$ is finite. For any $i \geq 1$, each element of $\Psi[i+1]$ can be written as a union of an element, ψ_i, of $\Psi[i]$ and an element of $\psi \in \Psi$. Since ψ_i and ψ are finite B-graphs, their union gives rise to finitely many (isomorphism classes of) B-graphs, since each is obtained as the disjoint union of ψ and ψ_i, followed with the identification of certain vertices and edges of ψ with those of ψ_i (and the number of such possible identifications is finite). Since ψ_i ranges over finitely many graphs of Ψ_i, and ψ the same of Ψ, $\Psi[i+1]$ is a finite set. Hence, by induction, for each i we have that $\Psi[i]$ is finite.

Since each element of $\Psi^+_{<r}$ belongs in one of the $\Psi[i]$ for $i < r$, we have that $\Psi^+_{<r}$ is finite. □

DEFINITION 2.5.9. For any two finite graphs, ψ, ψ', let $N(\psi, \psi')$ denote the number of injections of ψ in ψ' as B-graphs. Of course, $N(\psi, \psi')$ depends only on the isomorphism class of ψ and ψ', so we may also view N as defined on pairs of isomorphism classes of graphs.

Clearly $N(\psi, \psi')$ is finite if ψ, ψ' are finite graphs.

DEFINITION 2.5.10. If ψ, ψ' are finite B-graphs, we write $\psi \leq_B \psi'$ if $N(\psi, \psi') > 0$.

It is easy to check that the above relation is reflexive and transitive, and that $\psi \leq_B \psi'$ and $\psi' \leq \psi$ implies that ψ and ψ' are isomorphic. Hence $\leq_B$ is a partial order on isomorphism classes of B-graphs.

Since each element of Ψ^+ is a finite B-graph, then, under $\leq_B$, each such element is greater than only a finite number of other graphs in Ψ^+. Hence Möbius inversion yields the following lemma (compare with Proposition 9.5 in [**Fri08**]).

LEMMA 2.5.11. *For any collection, Ψ, of connected, pruned graphs of order at least one, there exist real numbers μ_Ω, indexed on elements, Ω, of B-graph classes*

Ψ^+, such that for any B-graph, G, we have

$$I_\Psi(G) = \sum_\Omega N(\Omega, G)\mu_\Omega \tag{2.45}$$

and the above sum is finite (and the sum is over one Ω in each isomorphism class of B-graphs).

PROOF. For each $\Omega \in \Psi^+$, we define μ_Ω inductively with respect to $\leq_B$, via

$$\mu_\Omega \; N(\Omega, \Omega) = 1 - \sum_{\Omega' <_B \Omega} N(\Omega', \Omega)\mu_{\Omega'},$$

where $<_B$ means $\leq_B$ and not isomorphic to; in other words, first we define μ_Ω for those minimal elements of Ψ^+; second we define μ_Ω for those elements, $\psi \in \Psi^+$, for which $\psi' <_B \psi$ and $\psi' \in \Psi^+$ implies that ψ' has already been defined, i.e., ψ' is minimal; etc. More formally, each $\psi \in \Psi^+$ has a maximal length chain of subgraphs

$$\psi_1 <_B \psi_2 <_B \cdots \psi_{m-1} <_B \psi_m = \psi$$

with $\psi_i \in \Psi^+$ and m as large as possible (the above m is finite since ψ_i is a proper subgraph of ψ_{i+1}, and on the m-th "step" of this process we define μ_ψ for all ψ whose maximal length chain is m.

Let us now show that (2.45) holds for all $G \in \Psi^+$, by induction on the number of edges of G. We remark that if G has two or more edges, then G is the union of all subgraphs of G with one less edge than G.

To begin the induction, we establish (2.45) if G has no edges or one edge. In this case, then all of G's connected components have order -1 or 0 (0 can occur if G has a self-loop). But we claim that if $\psi \in \Psi^+$, then $N(\psi, G)$ is zero. Indeed, if $N(\psi, G) > 0$, then any connected component of ψ must inject into a component of G. But since each vertex of Ψ^+ is of degree at least two, then this component of G must consist of one vertex and one self-loop, the only edge in G. But then this connected component of ψ must consist entirely of one vertex and one self-loop, which contradicts the fact that each connected component of Ψ^+ has positive order. It follows that $N(\psi, G) = 0$ for all $\psi \in \Psi^+$, and hence (2.45) holds for any G with zero or one edges.

Now we can prove (2.45) for any G, by induction on the number of edges in G. Assume that (2.45) holds whenever G has at most $i \geq 1$ edges. If G is isomorphic to an element of Ψ^+, then (2.45) holds by its definition. Otherwise, no injection of an element of Ψ^+ can reach all the edges of G. Hence, if $G_1, \ldots, G_m$ denote all graphs obtained by deleting one edge of G (and not deleting any vertices), then we have that $I_\Psi(G)$ is one iff $I_\Psi(G_i)$ is one for some i. Hence, by inclusion/exclusion, we have that

$$I_\Psi(G) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{j_1 < \cdots < j_i} I_\Psi(G_{j_1} \cap \cdots \cap G_{j_i})$$

and also

$$N(\Omega, G) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{j_1 < \cdots < j_i} N(\Omega, G_{j_1} \cap \cdots \cap G_{j_i}),$$

and now we use the inductive assumption, multiply the above equation by μ_Ω and sum over Ω to conclude (2.45). □

It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[I_\Psi(G)\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r(G,k)] = \sum_{\Omega\in\Psi^+}\mu_\Omega\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r(G,k)\,N(\Omega,G)]$$

$$= \sum_{(w,\vec{t})\in\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r(G,k)}\ \sum_{(\Omega,\xi),\ \Omega\in\Psi^+}\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}[(w;\vec{t}),(\Omega,\xi)]_n\mu_\Omega, \tag{2.46}$$

where the symmetric expectation is summed over one element $(\vec{t},\xi)$ for each isomorphism class. Similarly

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[I_\Psi(G)]$$

$$= \sum_{(\Omega,\xi),\ \Omega\in\Psi^+}\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}[(\Omega,\xi)]_n\ \mu_\Omega, \tag{2.47}$$

summed over one representative ξ in each equivalence class (compare (37) and (38) of [**Fri08**]).

LEMMA 2.5.12. *Let Ψ be a set of connected B-graphs, each pruned and of order at least one. Then in* (2.47)*, we may replace Ψ^+ with $\Psi^+_{<r}$, with a difference of at most Cn^{-r} (in absolute value), where C depends on Ψ, r, and B.*

PROOF. We begin by establish the following claim, which we will use repeatedly: if $\psi\in\Psi^+$ is of order at least r, then we claim that ψ contains, as a B-subgraph, an element of Ψ^+ of order at most $r+s-1$, where s is the maximum number of edges of an element of Ψ. Indeed, for any B-graph, ψ', and any $\psi\in\Psi$, we have that

$$\mathrm{ord}(\psi'\cup\psi)\le\mathrm{ord}(\psi')+s,$$

since adding ψ to ψ' increases the number of edges in ψ' by at most s, and does not decrease the number of vertices, and hence

$$\mathrm{ord}(\psi'\cup\psi) = |E_{\psi'\cup\psi}| - |V_{\psi'\cup\psi}| \le |E_{\psi'}| + s - |V_{\psi'}| = \mathrm{ord}(\psi') + s.$$

Since any $\psi\in\Psi^+$ can be written as a union $\psi_1\cup\cdots\cup\psi_m$, then if j is the smallest integer for which the order of $\psi_1\cup\cdots\cup\psi_j$ is greater than $r-1$, then this order can be no greater than $r-1+s$.

Let $\Psi^+_{\ge r}$ be those elements of Ψ^+ of order at least r, and let E be the set of B-graphs that contain at least one element of $\Psi^+_{\ge r}$. If E' is the complement of E, i.e., those graphs that do not contain any element of $\Psi^+_{\ge r}$, then we have

$$I_\Psi(G) = \sum_{\Omega\in\Psi^+_{<r}} N(\Omega,G)\mu_\Omega.$$

In other words, for all G we have

$$I_{E'}(G)I_\Psi(G) = I_{E'}(G)\sum_{\Omega\in\Psi^+_{<r}} N(\Omega,G)\mu_\Omega.$$

and hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\ I_{E'}(G)I_\Psi(G)\ ] = \sum_{\Omega\in\Psi^+_{<r}}\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\ I_{E'}(G)N(\Omega,G)\ ]\mu_\Omega. \tag{2.48}$$

To prove the lemma, i.e., that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_\Psi(G)\,] = \sum_{\Omega\in\Psi^+_{<r}} \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, N(\Omega,G)\,]\mu_\Omega, \tag{2.49}$$

it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_{E'}(G)I_\Psi(G)\,] = \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_\Psi(G)\,] + O(n^{-r})$$

and that for every $\Omega\in\Psi^+_{<r}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_{E'}(G)N(\Omega,G)\,] = \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, N(\Omega,G)\,] + O(n^{-r}).$$

Since $I_{E'}(G)+I_E(G)=1$, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_E(G)I_\Psi(G)\,] = O(n^{-r}), \tag{2.50}$$

(of course $I_E(G)I_\Psi(G)$ is just $I_E(G)$) and that for each $\Omega\in\Psi^+_{<r}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_E(G)N(\Omega,G)\,] = O(n^{-r}). \tag{2.51}$$

First let us prove (2.50). If $G\in\Psi^+_{\geq r}$, then G contains an element of Ψ^+ of order between r and $r+s-1$. But the set of elements of Ψ^+ of order between r and $r+s-1$ is a finite set, and the probability of G containing any particular element of this finite set is, by Theorem 2.4.7, at most $n^{-r}+O(n^{-r-1})$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_E(G)I_\Psi(G)\,] \leq \sum_{\substack{\psi\in\Psi^+\\ r\leq \mathrm{ord}(\psi)\leq r+s-1}} \left(n^{-r}+O(n^{-r-1})\right)$$

which establishes (2.50).

Next let us similarly show (2.51). If $G\in E$, then G has subgraphs $\psi_1,\ldots,\psi_m$, each isomorphic to an element of Ψ, for which

$$\psi = \psi_1\cup\cdots\cup\psi_m$$

is of order at least r. Fix an $\Omega\in\Psi^+_{<r}$. Consider any inclusion of Ω in G, and let G' be its image. Then by successively adding to G' the graphs ψ_i, for $i=1,\ldots,m$, at some point we obtain a graph $\Omega'\in\Psi^+$,

$$\Omega' = \Omega\cup\psi_1\cup\cdots\cup\psi_j.$$

for some j, which is of order between r and $r+s-1$. It follows that

$$N(\Omega,G) \leq \sum_{\Omega'} N(\Omega,\Omega')N(\Omega',G), \tag{2.52}$$

with the sum ranging over the finite set of elements, Ω', of Ψ^+ of order between r and $r+s$. Taking expectations yields

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, N(\Omega,G)\,] \leq \sum_{\Omega'} N(\Omega,\Omega')\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, N(\Omega',G)\,],$$

and applying Theorem 2.4.7 shows that the right-hand-side is at most $O(n^{-r})$. This establishes (2.51) and completes the proof. □

LEMMA 2.5.13. *Let Ψ be a set of connected B-graphs, each pruned and of order at least one. Then in* (2.46)*, we may replace Ψ^+ with $\Psi^+_{<r}$, with a difference of at most $C\mu_1(B)^k n^{-r}k^{2r+2}$ (in absolute value), where C depends on Ψ, r, and B.*

PROOF. We use the same ideas and notation as in the proof of Lemma 2.5.12. With E as in the proof there, it suffices to show that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_E(G)\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r(G,k)\,] = O(\rho(H_B)^k)n^{-r}, \tag{2.53}$$

and that for each $\Omega \in \Psi^+_{<r}$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_E(G)\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r(G,k)\, N(\Omega,G)\,] = O(n^{-r}). \tag{2.54}$$

Equation 2.50 shows that that the probability that $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ lies in E is $O(n^{-r})$. However, $\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r(G,k)$ is never more than $\mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)$, which is at most a constant times $\rho(H_B)^k$. This establishes (2.53).

For each $\Omega \in \Psi^+_{<r}$, in the proof of Lemma 2.5.12 we have seen that (2.52) implies that the expected value of $I_E(G)N(\Omega,G)$ is $O(n^{-r})$. Since $\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r(G,k)$ is never more than $\mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_E(G)\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r(G,k)\, N(\Omega,G)\,] &\le \mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_E(G)\, N(\Omega,G)\,] \\ &\le \rho(H_B)^k\, O(n^{-r}).\end{aligned}$$

□

Hence, to prove Theorems 2.5.1 and 2.5.2, it suffices to prove an asymptotic expansion, for any fixed $\Omega \in \Psi^+_{<r}$ for

$$\sum_{(w,\vec{t})\in\mathrm{CertSNBC}_r}\ \sum_{\xi}\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[(w;\vec{t}),(\Omega,\xi)]$$

and the same without the $(w,\vec{t})$.

2.5.2. Proof of Theorem 2.5.2.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5.2. First we will show that for each B-graph $\Omega \in \Psi^+$, any two (feasible) potential specializations, ξ and ξ', which are maps $V_\Omega \to \{1,\dots,n\}$, yield equivalent events (Ω,ξ) and (Ω,ξ'). Indeed, these events give a B-isomorphism of Ω with some subgraph of some element of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, and hence the B-graph that (Ω,ξ) and (Ω,ξ') describe are isomorphic as B-graphs. Hence the sum over all feasible classes $[\xi]$ in

$$\sum_{[(\Omega,\xi)]}\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}[(\Omega,\xi)]_n$$

consists of precisely one class $[\xi]$. Furthermore, this class has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion given by (2.44) (where a_e counts the number of edges over e in Ω, and similarly for b_v).

By Lemma 2.5.12 we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, I_\Psi(G)\,] = O(n^{-r}) + \sum_{\Omega\in\Psi^+}\sum_{[(\Omega,\xi)]}\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}[\, N(\Omega,G)\,]\,\mu_\Omega.$$

But $\Psi^+_{<r}$ is a finite set, and by the preceeding paragraph each term in the above equation with a fixed Ω has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion. Hence we conclude that the expected value of $I_\Psi(G)$ has a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to order r for any integer $r > 0$. □

2.5.3. The Proof of Theorem 2.5.1. This subsection is devoted to proving Theorem 2.5.1. Like the proof of Theorem 2.5.2, the point is that we may fix an $\Omega \in \Psi^+_{<r}$, of which there are only finitely many. We then need to consider a joint event of a potential walk, $(w, \vec{t})$, and a potential graph specialization, (Ω, ξ). We essentially have to show that all the methods of Sections 2.3 and 2.4 carry over to this more general case. Then we will appeal to Lemma 2.5.13 to complete the proof.

This was done in [**Fri08**], where it was a rather long—albeit straightforward—process. In this article we shall simplify this process by defining the generalized types and forms as automatically incorporating the data of Ω into them. This means that our definitions will be more complicated than the corresponding Definitions 9.7 and 9.8 in [**Fri08**], but then the verification Theorem 2.5.1 is (a bit) simpler.

Let us give the rough idea. If $(w, \vec{t})$ is a potential walk, and (Ω, ξ) a potential specialization of Ω, an Ω-*type* should remember all the vertices and edges of Ω, as well as all beaded paths left upon deleting any other vertices that are not the starting vertex and not a vertex of degree three or greater. Aside from this, we should be able to reconstruct all the type data, i.e., the vertices and edges traversed by w, in their order, and the labelling, or local data around all the type vertices.

Proof of Theorem 2.5.1.

Definition 2.5.14. Let Ω be a B-graph for a graph, B. By an Ω-*type*, we mean the data $\mathcal{T} = (T_1, T, \gamma_V, \gamma_E, \mathcal{L}, \nu_\Omega)$, such that

(1) T_1 is a graph, and ν_Ω is an injection of Ω into T_1;
(2) T is a subgraph of T_1, and γ_V, γ_E are an ordering of the vertices and edges of T, along with an orientation for each edge of T;
(3) T_1 is the union of T and the image of Ω;
(4) $\mathcal{L}$ is a labelling of all the vertices in T_1, which respects the B-vertices the B-edges in the structure of Ω under ν_Ω; and
(5) the vertices of T consist of the union of the following: (1) all vertices in the image of ν_Ω; (2) all vertices of degree at least three; and (3) the first vertex, in the order given by γ_V.

We say that an edge of T is *variable length* if it is not shared with Ω, i.e., not in the image of ν_Ω; otherwise we say that the edge is *unit length*.

Definition 2.5.15. Let $\mathcal{T} = (T_1, T, \gamma_V, \gamma_E, \mathcal{L}, \nu_\Omega)$ be an Ω-type. By an Ω-*form of type* $\mathcal{T}$ we mean a B-graph, Γ, obtained from $\mathcal{T}$ by taking every variable length edge of T and replacing it by a beaded path, with a map to B, which is consistent with the lettering, $\mathcal{L}$.

Definition 2.5.16. By a *specialization (in* $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$*)* of a Ω-form, Γ, we mean any map $\vec{t}\colon V_\Gamma \to \{1, \ldots, n\}$. We say that two specializations, $\vec{t}, \vec{t}'$ are *equivalent*, denoted $\vec{t} \sim \vec{t}'$, if their values differ by a permutation of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. To any pair of a potential walk, $(w, \vec{t})$ and an Ω-specialization in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, (Ω, ξ), we associate a (unique) Ω-type, $\mathcal{T} = (T_1, T, \gamma_V, \gamma_E, \mathcal{L}, nu_\Omega)$, with T_1 being the union of Graph(w) and the image of Ω under ξ, and T being the edges and vertices of T_1 in the image of Graph(w), and $\gamma_V, \gamma_E, \mathcal{L}$ all arising from the order and orientation in which Graph(w) edges are traversed.

Now we wish to describe how to modify the methods of Sections 2.3 and 2.4 to prove Theorem 2.5.1. The results in Section 2.3 will hold for any walk collection,

$\mathcal{W} = \{\mathcal{W}(k,n)\}_{k,n\geq 1}$ and any collection of graphs, Ψ, of pruned, connected graphs of order at least one. (It is simpler to assume that the elements of Ψ are connected, but one can also prove this if the elements of Ψ are not connected, provided that each of their connected components is of order at least one.) So fix any walk collection, $\mathcal{W}$, and graph collection, Ψ, as such.

Fix an $\Omega \in \Psi^+_{<r}$. We first consider the results in Sections 2.3, and describe how they apply to Ω-forms and Ω-types:

(1) Proposition 2.3.8 clearly holds for Ω-forms, with a_e and b_v counting all elements over B edges and vertices in the Ω-form.

(2) Theorem 2.3.10 holds in this setting, i.e., for any potential walk, $(w;\vec{t})$ and potential specification (Ω,ξ), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{symm}}[(w;\vec{t})(\Omega,\xi)]_n = n^{-\operatorname{ord}(\mathcal{F})}\left(p_0 + \frac{p_1}{n} + \ldots + \frac{p_{r-1}}{n^{r-1}} + \frac{\mathrm{error}(k,n)}{n^r}\right), \tag{2.55}$$

where $\mathcal{F}$ is the Ω-form corresponding to $(w;\vec{t})$ and (Ω,ξ), and the p_i are polynomials of $a_e = a_e(\mathcal{F})$ and $b_v = b_v(\mathcal{F})$, or just of the a_e alone, with $\mathrm{error}(k,n)$ satisfying (2.24)

(3) We now prove Theorem 2.3.13 with the following modification: we consider, for each equivalence class, $[(w;\vec{t}),(\Omega,\xi)]$ the union of the graph of $(w;\vec{t})$ union the image of Ω, and we first determine the vertices of the graph over Ω, i.e., we first determine the random variables $\{i'_v\}_{v\in V_\Omega}$ given by $\xi\colon V_\Omega \to \{\pi(v), i'_v\}$, where $\pi\colon \Omega \to V_B$ is given by the B-graph structure of Ω. After determining all of the i'_v (in some fixed order imposed on V_Ω) we then determine the variables $i_0, i_1, \ldots, i_k$—in the notation of the proof of Lemma 1.3.5 or Theorem 2.3.13—where i_0 may already be fixed by the $\{i'_v\}_{v\in V_\Omega}$ or, otherwise, may take any value from $\{1,\ldots,n\}$ that is not assumed previously as $(\pi(v), i'_v)$ with $v \in V_\Omega$, i.e., where $\pi(v) = v_0$ and $t(v_0) = i'_v$. When determining the random variables $\{i'_v\}$ with $v \in V_\Omega$, and then $i_0,\ldots,i_k$, throughout we regard each of these random variables (i_0 is not really a random variable, but a variable whose value is either fixed or varying among at least $n - |V_\Omega|$ values) using the same notion of coincidences (and "fixed choices" and "free, non-coincidence choices," as in the proof of Theorem 2.3.13); before considering the $i_0,\ldots,i_k$, if the i'_v are determined in any fixed order, then their choice falls again into the categories (1)–(3) of the proof of Theorem 2.3.13 (there is nothing about the classifications (1)–(3) that requires successive i'_v values to come from a (strictly non-backtracking closed) walk in G). Determining the i'_v and i_j involves a choice of $k + |V_\Omega|$ random variables, and hence we get the same expansion theorem as in Theorem 2.3.13, except that the k needs to be replaced with $k + |V_\Omega|$, which, since Ω is fixed, means that we get the same bound, except that the constant in the error bound (2.27) depends on B, r, and Ω.

(4) We then deduce Theorem 2.3.23 with the following minor changes: (1) all $Q_{\mathcal{T},i}(k)$ and $P_i(\vec{k})$ and constant $c = c(r,B)$ now become dependent also on Ω; (2) the $\vec{k}$ and $\vec{m}$ now lie in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{\mathrm{Var}_T}$, where Var_T are the variable length edges of T in $\mathcal{T}$. Of course, a sequence of edges in E_T that determine a beaded path in T must have the same $\vec{m}$ values, but this is not important (this information is incorporated into the function $W_{\mathcal{T}}(\vec{m})$).

Next we give the modifications necessary to obtain the results in Section 2.4.

(1) We view $\vec{m}, \vec{k}$ indexed over E_T, although for the unit length edges, $e \in E_T$, $k(e)$ is always 1.
(2) A tangle refers to Hashimoto eigenvalue bounds on $\mathrm{VLG}(T, \vec{k})$.
(3) The same finiteness of minimal tangle elements and minimal certificates for the certified trace hold; both involve the partially ordered set $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{\mathrm{Var}_T}$, where Var_T is the set of variable length edges of T, as determined by $\mathcal{T}$, both arising from the variable $\vec{k}'$ which is the restriction of $\vec{k}$ to Var_T. However, it becomes simpler to refer to certificates and minimal tangles over $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$, by adding in the unit length edges of E_T
(4) The polyexponential functions are functions of the variables $\vec{k}'$, with the other $\vec{k}$ values fixed at the value one.
(5) Since $\vec{k}, \vec{m}$ take values in E_T, we still have
$$\vec{m} \cdot \vec{k} = k.$$
(6) Theorem 2.4.30 still holds, with $\vec{k}_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{E_T}$.
(7) We still divide all edges of E_T (including the unit length edges) into the "short" and "long" edges; the crucial Lemma 2.4.34 goes through verbatim, and hence we conclude Theorem 2.4.31 by the same division of E_T into "short" and "long" edges.

We conclude Theorem 2.5.1.

□

2.5.4. Concluding the Proofs of Theorems 2.1.3 and 2.1.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1.3. Apply Theorem 2.5.1 with Ψ taken to be $\mathrm{Tangle}_{r,B}^{\min}$, which we know is finite (by Theorem 2.4.2) and consists of connected graphs of order at least one. □

Proof of Theorem 2.1.1. If G has no B-tangles of order r, then
$$\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k) = \mathrm{SNBC}_{<r}(G,k),$$
with SNBC the walk collection of Example 2.3.6 (of all strictly non-backtracking closed walks) and $\mathrm{SNBC}_{<r}$ is its truncated form (of Definition 2.3.11). Hence
$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\, \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{CertTr}_{<r}(G,k)\,\big] = \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\, \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{SNBC}_{<r}(G,k)\,\big].$$
It follows from Theorem 2.3.13 it follows that
$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\, \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{SNBC}_{<r}(G,k)\,\big]\\ &= \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\, \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\,\mathrm{SNBC}(G,k)\,\big] + O(k^{2r+2}\,\mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)n^{-r}).\end{aligned}$$
But $\mathrm{SNBC}(G,k)$ is just $\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k)$. □

2.6. The Side-Stepping Lemma

In this section, we prove a new version of the side-stepping lemma in [**Fri08**]. We improve this lemma to the more general case where we consider polyexponential functions with bases being all the Hashimoto eigenvalues strictly greater than $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$, which will allow us to use the $1/n$-asymptotic expansions with B-Ramanujan coefficients have to conclude Theorem 0.1.1.

The key idea is to use the fact that we can have an expansion for several consecutive values of k and apply the shift operator, described in the next subsection, several times. This side-stepping lemma is stated for an abstract collection of finite probability spaces.

2.6.1. The Shift Operator. Let S denote the *shift operator in* k, meaning the operator on functions, $f(k)$, defined on non-negative integers, k, taking f to

$$(Sf)(n,k) = f(n,k+1)$$

For any integer $i \geq 0$ we let S^i denote the i-fold application of S, so that

$$(S^i f)(n,k) = f(n,k+i)$$

For any polynomial (with real or complex coefficients),

$$Q(z) = q_0 + q_1 z + \cdots + q_t z^t$$

we define $Q(S)$ in the natural way, i.e.,

$$Q(S) = q_0 S^0 + q_1 S^1 + \cdots + q_t S^t$$

The utility of polynomials in S is due to the following simple observations.

PROPOSITION 2.6.1. *Let $Q(z), Q_1(z)$ be a polynomials, with real or complex coefficients. Then we have*

(1) $(Q(S))(\mu^k) = Q(\mu)\mu^k$ for any $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$;
(2) $Q(S)Q_1(S) = Q_1(S)Q(S)$ as operators; and
(3) $(S-\mu)^D(f) \equiv 0$ for any function $f(k) = \mu^k p(k)$ where $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ and p is a polynomial of degree at most $D-1$.

PROOF. (1) and (2) are straightforward and (3) is a consequence of the following identity,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{D} \binom{D}{k} (-1)^k k^d = 0$$

for any $N \geq 0$ and any $d < D$. □

When $h(k)$ is a function for which we do not have a simple expression, but is rather bounded by a polyexponential function (such as in our "error terms"), we employ the following crude bound.

LEMMA 2.6.2. *Let $h(k)$ be a function for which*

$$|h(k)| \leq C\tau^k k^C,$$

for some positive real numbers C and τ with $\tau \geq 1$. Let $Q(x)$ be any complex polynomial of degree at most $D-1$. Then, for $k \geq 0$, we have

$$|Q(S)h(k)| \leq CD\|Q\|\tau^{k+D}(k+D)^C$$

Where $\|Q\|$ denotes the largest absolute value of Q's coefficients. In particular, for fixed Q and τ we have for all $k \geq 0$

$$|Q(S)h(k)| \leq C'\tau^k k^{C'} \tag{2.56}$$

for some constant C'.

PROOF. Denote

$$Q(x) = q_0 + q_1 x + \cdots + q_{D-1} x^{D-1}$$

and for any non-negative integer i we clearly have

$$|S^i h(k)| \leq C\tau^{k+i}(k+i)^C \leq C\tau^{k+D}(k+D)^C$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} |Q(S)h(k)| &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{D-1} |q_i| \, |S^i h(K)| \\ &\leq D\|Q\| C\tau^{k+D}(k+D)^C \end{aligned}$$

Clearly the last equation of the lemma, (2.56), follows. □

2.6.2. Statement of the Side-Stepping Lemma. The main lemma of this subsection, Lemma 2.6.7, generalizes the Side-Stepping Lemma of [**Fri08**], both of which can be viewed as abstract lemmas in probability theory. Of course, these abstract lemmas are motived by our trace methods, and we will need Lemma 2.6.7 to prove the Hashimoto version of the generalized Alon conjecture for all base graphs, B, which are d-regular. Also, Lemma 2.6.7, especially (2.59), is, arguably, more direct and simpler than the Side-Stepping Lemma in [**Fri08**].

This section involves a number of positive, real constants, depending on various parameters, that need to be chosen sufficiently large; we will generally use the letters C, C', C'', for various of these constants, when no confusion is likely to arise.

DEFINITION 2.6.3. By a *finite probability space* we mean a pair, (Ω, ν), where Ω is a finite set, and a probability measure, ν, which we view as a function $\nu\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $\nu(\omega) \geq 0$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$, and

$$\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \nu(\omega) = 1.$$

We will view ν as giving a measure to each subset $E \subset \Omega$ in the usual way, i.e.,

$$\nu(E) = \sum_{\omega \in E} \nu(\omega).$$

By a *complex random variable* on (Ω, ν) we mean a function $\mu\colon \Omega \to \mathbb{C}$; similarly we define a *real random variable*.

We often write

$$\mathrm{Prob}_\Omega[E] \text{ for } \nu(E)$$

and, for a random variable, $\mu = \mu(\omega)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega}[\mu(\omega)] \text{ for } \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \nu(\omega)\mu(\omega)$$

As such, the measure ν will often be omitted in notation, being implicit in the notation $\mathrm{Prob}_\Omega[E]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega}[\, \mu(\omega)\,]$.

Now we come to the main definition which describes the hypothesis to our side-stepping lemmas as an *abstract partial trace* setup, designed to be applied to Theorem 2.4.31, at least for regular B.

DEFINITION 2.6.4. Let τ_0, τ_1, γ be positive real numbers for which $\tau_0 < \tau_1$; let L be a finite collection of real numbers, each of whose absolute value is strictly larger than τ_0 and at most τ_1; let r be a positive integer. By an *abstract partial trace with parameters* $(\tau_0, \tau_1, \gamma, L, r)$ we mean the following data for each positive integer, n:

(1) a finite probability space, (Ω_n, ν_n);
(2) complex random variables $\mu_i = \mu_i(\omega)$ on (Ω_n, ν_n) such that for all $i = 1, \ldots, \gamma n$ and $\omega \in \Omega_n$ we have

$$\mu_i(\omega) \in R_1 \cup R_2,$$

where

$$R_1 = \{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid |z| \leq \tau_0\}, \quad R_2 = \{z \in \mathbb{R} \mid \tau_0 < |z| \leq \tau_1\};$$

(3) there are polyexponentials $P_0(k), P_1(k), \ldots$ with bases in L, for which we have

$$\sum_{\omega \in E_n} \nu_n(\omega) \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma n} \mu_i^k(\omega) = P_0(k) + P_1(k) n^{-1} + \cdots + P_{r-1}(k) n^{1-r} + \mathrm{err}_r(n,k) \tag{2.57}$$

for all positive integers k, n with $1 \leq k \leq \gamma n^\gamma$, where $\mathrm{err}_r(n,k)$ is a function such that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there is a constant, C (depending on ε and r) for which

$$|\mathrm{err}_r(n,k)| \leq C k^C \Big(\tau_1^k n^{-r} + (\tau_0 + \varepsilon)^k \Big).$$

EXAMPLE 2.6.5. We will apply the above setting to $\Omega_n = \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with the following parameters when B is d-regular: $\tau_0 = \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$, $\tau_1 = \rho(H_B$, $\gamma = |E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}|$; the choice of $\mu_i(\omega)$ is a bit intricate: we will fix an $\varepsilon' > 0$ and take the $\mu_i(\omega)$ be either (1) all zero, if G contains a (B, ε')-tangle, or (2) the Hashimoto eigenvalues of G, except that the old Hashimoto eigenvalues will be set to zero. Note that the ε' in this paragraph is different from the ε in Lemma 2.6.7.

We remark that above setting essentially permits the random variables $\mu_i(\omega)$, to range over $i = 1, \ldots, f(n)$ for any function, $f(n)$, bounded by γn for some fixed γ; this can be done simply by introducing new "dummy" random variables, $\mu_i(\omega) = 0$ for $i = f(n) + 1, \ldots, \gamma n$.

We shall prove a lemma which will apply (2.57) for numerous values of k to show that it is "unlikely" for $\omega \in \Omega_n$ that some $\mu_i(\omega)$ is larger than $\tau_0 + \varepsilon$ in absolute value but not near any $\ell \in L$. We shall also obtain important information on the "dominant" part of the $P_i(k)$ corresponding to the ℓ^k term for each $\ell \in L$. To describe this, we need some further terminology.

DEFINITION 2.6.6. Consider an abstract partial trace as defined above with parameters $(\tau_0, \tau_1, C, L, r)$ and with Ω_n, ν_n, μ_i as above. For any $\varepsilon, \delta > 0$ and integer n, set

$$\mathrm{Out}(\delta, \varepsilon) = \{z \in \mathbb{R} \mid \tau_0 + \varepsilon < |z| \leq \tau_1 \text{ and } |z - \ell| > \delta \text{ for all } \ell \in L\}$$

and

$$\mathrm{Exception}_n(\delta, \varepsilon) = \{\omega \in \Omega_n \mid \mu_i(\omega) \in \mathrm{Out}_n(\delta, \varepsilon) \text{ for some } i\}$$

and

$$\mathrm{AbsoluteException}_n(\varepsilon) = \{\omega \in \Omega_n \mid |\mu_i(\omega)| > \tau_0 + \varepsilon \text{ for some } i\}.$$

Also set

$$\mathrm{Near}_n(\ell,\delta) = \mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\Big[\ \Big|\big\{i\ \Big|\ |\mu_i(G)-\ell|\le\delta\ \big\}\Big|\ \Big],$$

i.e., the expected number of $\mu_i(\omega)$ which lie within δ of ℓ.

LEMMA 2.6.7 (Improved Side-Stepping Lemma). *Consider an abstract partial trace with parameters (τ_0,τ_1,C,L,r) as above, with Ω_n,ν_n,μ_i,P_i as above. For any $\alpha,\varepsilon>0$ there exists a $\theta>0$ for which*

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{Exception}_n(n^{-\theta},\varepsilon)]\le n^{-\alpha} \tag{2.58}$$

for n sufficiently large, provided that

$$r\ge F(\alpha,\varepsilon,\tau_1,\tau_0),$$

for some function F. Furthermore, write

$$P_i(k)=\sum_{\ell\in L}p_{\ell,i}(k)\ell^k,$$

i.e., let $p_{\ell,i}(k)$ be the polynomial coefficient of ℓ^k in $P_i(k)$. Assume that for some j and $\ell\in L$ we have that

$$p_{\ell,0}(k)=\cdots=p_{\ell,j-1}(k)=0.$$

Then $p_{\ell,j}(k)$ is a constant (i.e., independent of k), and this constant is the limit

$$p_{\ell,j}=\lim_{n\to\infty}n^j\,\mathrm{Near}_n\big(\ell,n^{-\theta}\big) \tag{2.59}$$

for any $\theta>0$ sufficiently small (i.e., there is a $\theta_0>0$ such that (2.59) holds for any θ with $0<\theta<\theta_0$), provided that

$$r>H(j,L,\tau_1,\tau_0,\varepsilon) \tag{2.60}$$

for some function, H. Finally, if j is any positive integer for which

$$P_0(k)=\cdots=P_{j-1}(k)=0,$$

then for each $\varepsilon>0$ there is a $C=C_\varepsilon$ for which

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{AbsoluteException}_n(\varepsilon)]\le C_\varepsilon n^{-j}. \tag{2.61}$$

It is an important aspect of the above lemma that it hold for all r sufficiently large, and that we explicitly describe the parameters involved in stating how large r has to be. The point is that Theorem 2.5.1 holds for any fixed r, but for each value of r it produces B-Ramanujan coefficients whose principle part involves various polynomial in k. We have to make sure that nothing about these polynomials (other than, say, $P_0,\dots,P_j$ for some fixed j) affects the condition on r. This will become clear in Section 2.7, when we prove the generalized Alon Conjecture for regular graphs, B.

Lemma 2.6.7 will be proven in the subsections that follow. The proofs are based on the simple idea of applying certain polynomials of the "shift operator in k" to (2.57). The basic idea behind these proofs is very simple: we let S denote the "shift operator in k," taking a function, $f(n,k)$, to the shifted function $(Sf)(n,k)=f(n,k+1)$; we begin our proof by establishing (2.58), by applying

$$Q(S)=\prod_{\ell\in L}(S-\ell)^D$$

to both sides of (2.57), where D is an even integer that is sufficiently large to annihilate the $P_i(k)$ for $i=0,\dots,r-1$ (this is explained in the next subsection,

but is essentially Item (3) of Proposition 2.6.1); we then prove the second part, regarding the $p_{\ell,i}(k)$, by applying, for each $\ell \in L$,

$$Q_{\ell,D}(S) = \prod_{\ell' \in L,\ \ell' \neq \ell} (S - \ell')^D$$

to both sides of (2.57), to isolate the effect of the μ_i near ℓ.

A very similar set of ideas appears in [**Fri08**], Section 11, where the side-stepping lemma there is proven only in the case $L = \{\tau_1\}$, which suffices for random d-regular graphs, i.e., base graph $B = W_{d/2}$ or B being one vertex and d half-loops. The proof of Lemma 2.6.7 is primarily complicated by the fact that L can have many elements, unlike the case in [**Fri08**] where L consists entirely of $d - 1$.

2.6.3. Proof of the First Exception Bound. In this subsection we will prove (2.58). In other words, fix an $\varepsilon > 0$; we will show that for any $\alpha > 0$, there exists a $\theta = \theta(\alpha) > 0$ for which (2.58) holds. First, let us describe $\theta = \theta(\alpha)$ explicitly, in rather unmotivated terms.

Let ϕ be any real number with $\phi > 2\alpha$. Let ϕ', ϕ'' be any real numbers satisfying

$$\phi' > \frac{\phi + 1}{\log \frac{\tau_0 + \varepsilon}{\tau_0 + (\varepsilon/2)}} \tag{2.62}$$

and

$$\phi'' > \frac{\phi + 2}{\log \frac{\tau_0 + \varepsilon}{\tau_0}}. \tag{2.63}$$

Let $\rho > 0$ be any real number for which

$$\rho < (1/2) \log(\tau_1/\tau_0). \tag{2.64}$$

Let r be any positive integer for which

$$r/2 > \max(\phi, \phi'/\rho, \phi''/\rho), \tag{2.65}$$

since $\phi, \phi', \phi'', \rho$ depend only on $\tau_0, \tau_1, \varepsilon, \alpha$, our stipulation on r can be viewed as a condition of the form

$$r \geq F(\alpha, \varepsilon, \tau_1, \tau_0)$$

for some function, F. Let $P_0, \ldots, P_{r-1}$ be as in Definition 2.6.4, and D be an even integer bounding the polynomial degree of the $p_{\ell,i}$ ranging over all $\ell \in L$ and $i = 0, \ldots, r-1$; we take θ to be any positive real number for which

$$\theta < \alpha/(|L|\, D); \tag{2.66}$$

hence θ, and $D, r, \rho, \phi, \phi', \phi''$, depend only on $\alpha, \varepsilon, \tau_0, \tau_1, L$. So θ can be viewed as a function depending only on $\alpha, \varepsilon, \tau_0, \tau_1, L$. For the rest of this subsection we will prove that this value of θ satisfies (2.58).

Our general approach is to note that

$$Q(S) = \prod_{\ell \in L} (S - \ell)^D,$$

satisfies $Q(S)P_i(k) = 0$ for all i; we shall apply $Q(S)$ to both sides of (2.57).

For the rest of this subsection, the letters C, C', C'' will refer to various constants that are independent of k and n, but may depend on any of $\alpha, \varepsilon, \tau_0, \tau_1, L$, and the above $\phi, \phi', \phi'', \rho, r, D, Q, \theta$, which are functions of $\alpha, \varepsilon, \tau_0, \tau_1, L$.

Let us begin with a few immediate remarks about $Q(S)$:

(1) for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $Q(\mu)$ is real and non-negative;

(2) we have $|Q(\mu)|$, for any μ with $|\mu| \leq \tau_1$ is bounded by a constant depending on Q and τ_1;
(3) for $\mu \notin B_\delta(L)$, where

$$B_\delta(L) = \bigcup_{\ell \in L} B_\delta(\ell), \quad \text{where} \quad B_\delta(\ell) = \big\{ z \ \big| \ |z - \ell| \leq \delta \big\},$$

we have

$$|Q(\mu)| \geq \delta^{|L|\,D};$$

(4) for any real $\tau > 0$, if $h(k) = \mu^k$ with $|\mu| \leq \tau$, then

$$|Q(S)h(k)| \leq C\tau^k$$

for some C depending only on Q;
(5) furthermore, if $h(k)$ is any function bounded by $Ck^C\tau^k$ for some C, then we have

$$|Q(S)h(k)| \leq C' k^{C'} \tau^k$$

for a constant, C', depending only on C and Q.

We are now ready to apply $Q(S)$ to both sides of (2.57). Beginning the with left-hand-side, we write:

$$Q(S)\mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega_n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\gamma n} \mu_i^k(\omega) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega_n} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{\gamma n} Q(S)\mu_i^k(\omega) \right];$$

note that for each i and ω for which $\mu_i(\omega) \notin \mathbb{R}$ we have $|\mu_i(\omega)| \leq \tau_0$, and hence

$$|Q(S)(\mu_i^k(\omega))| \leq C'\tau_0^k,$$

where C' is independent of n, k. Since there are γn values of i in the above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma n} Q(S)\mu_i^k(\omega) &\geq \sum_{i,\ \mu_i \in \mathbb{R}} Q(S)\mu_i^k(\omega) - \sum_{i,\ \mu_i \notin \mathbb{R}} |Q(S)\mu_i^k(\omega)| \\ &\geq \sum_{i,\ \mu_i \in \mathbb{R}} Q(S)\mu_i^k(\omega) - C''n\tau_0^k \end{aligned}$$

for some constant C'' independent of n, k. Furthermore, since $Q(\mu) \geq 0$ for μ real, we have for any $j = 1, \ldots, \gamma n$ and $\omega \in \Omega_n$ for which $\mu_j = \mu_j(\omega)$ is real

$$Q(\mu_j)\mu_j^k \leq \sum_{i,\ \mu_i \in \mathbb{R}} Q(S)\mu_i^k(\omega) \leq C''n\tau_0^k + Q(S) \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma n} Q(S)\mu_i^k(\omega).$$

But for each $\omega \in \text{Exception}_n(\delta, \varepsilon)$ we have $\mu_j(\omega) \in \text{Out}(\delta, \varepsilon)$ for some j, and hence

$$Q(\mu_j(\omega))\mu_j^k(\omega)$$

is non-negative, and bounded from below by

$$\delta^{|L|\,D}(\tau_0 + \varepsilon)^k.$$

It follows that for $\omega \in \text{Exception}_n(\delta, \varepsilon)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}_n[\text{Exception}_n(\delta, \varepsilon)]\delta^{|L|\,D}(\tau_0 + \varepsilon)^k &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega_n} \left[\sum_{i,\ \mu_i(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}} Q(S)\mu_i^k(\omega) \right] \\ &\leq C''n\tau_0^k + Q(S)\text{LHS}, \end{aligned}$$

where LHS is the left-hand-side of (2.57), i.e.,

$$\text{LHS} = \mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{\gamma n}\mu_i^k(\omega)\right].$$

But the left-hand-side of (2.57) equals its right-hand-side, RHS, and $Q(S)$ applied to any $P_i(k)$ vanishes; hence

$$\text{Prob}_n[\text{Exception}_n(\delta,\varepsilon)]\delta^{|L|\,D}(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k \le C''n\tau_0^k + Q(S)\text{RHS} \tag{2.67}$$

$$\le C''n\tau_0^k + \Big|Q(S)\big(h_1(k)+h_2(n,k)\big)\Big|, \tag{2.68}$$

for any k, n with $k + D \le n/2$, where

$$|h_1(k)| \le Ck^C\big(\tau_0+(\varepsilon/2)\big)^k, \quad |h_2(n,k)| \le Ck^C\tau_1^k n^{-r}$$

for some constant, C, independent of n, k. Lemma 2.6.2 implies that

$$|Q(S)h_1(k)| \le Ck^C\big(\tau_0+(\varepsilon/2)\big)^k \tag{2.69}$$

and

$$|Q(S)h_2(n,k)| \le Ck^C\tau_1^k n^{-r} \tag{2.70}$$

for a new constant, C, independent of n, k. Combining these estimates with (2.67) and (2.68) we have

$$\text{Prob}_n[\text{Exception}_n(\delta,\varepsilon)] \le \delta^{-|L|\,D}C\left(\frac{n\tau_0^k + k^C\big(\tau_0+(\varepsilon/2)\big)^k + k^C\tau_1^k n^{-r}}{(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k}\right), \tag{2.71}$$

with C independent of n, k.

We claim that setting k to be

$$k = f(n) = \text{ the smallest even integer greater than } \max(\phi',\phi'')\log n, \tag{2.72}$$

for sufficiently large n we have that (2.71) implies

$$\text{Prob}_n[\text{Exception}_n(\delta,\varepsilon)] \le 3\delta^{-|L|\,D}n^{-\phi}; \tag{2.73}$$

if we can establish this claim, then (2.58) follows by taking $\delta = n^{-\theta}$, for then, in view of (2.66)

$$\text{Prob}_n[\text{Exception}_n(n^{-\theta},\varepsilon)] \le 3n^{-|L|\,D\theta}n^{-\phi} \le n^{-\phi+\alpha}$$

which, since $\phi > 2\alpha$, is at most $n^{-\alpha}$ for sufficiently large n.

So we will finish this subsection, i.e., the proof of (2.58), by establishing (2.73).

To show (2.73), from (2.71) is suffices to show that each of the three expressions

$$\frac{Cn\tau_0^k}{(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k}, \quad \frac{Ck^C\big(\tau_0+(\varepsilon/2)\big)^k}{(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{Ck^C\tau_1^k n^{-r}}{(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k}$$

is bounded by $n^{-\phi}$ for n sufficiently large. For the first expression, we note that

$$\frac{Cn\tau_0^k}{(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k} \le Cn\big(\tau_0/(\tau_0+\varepsilon)\big)^k \le Cn\big(\tau_0/(\tau_0+\varepsilon)\big)^{\phi''\log n} \le Cnn^{-\phi-2} = Cn^{-\phi-1},$$

using (2.72) and (2.63), which is therefore bounded by $n^{-\phi}$ for sufficiently large n. For the second expression, we note that

$$\frac{Ck^C\big(\tau_0+(\varepsilon/2)\big)^k}{(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k} \leq Ck^C\left(\frac{\tau_0+(\varepsilon/2)}{\tau_0+\varepsilon}\right)^{\phi'\log n} \leq Ck^Cn^{-\phi-1},$$

using (2.72) and (2.62), which is therefore bounded by $n^{-\phi}$ for sufficiently large n. For the third expression, we note that

$$k \leq \max(\phi',\phi'')\log n + 2$$

by virtue of (2.72), and hence

$$k \leq \rho(r/2)\log n$$

for sufficiently large n, by virtue of (2.65), and hence

$$\frac{Ck^C\tau_1^kn^{-r}}{(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k} \leq Ck^Cn^{-r}(\tau_1/\tau_0)^k \leq Ck^Cn^{-r}n^{r/2} = Ck^Cn^{-r/2},$$

using (2.64), and by virtue of (2.65), $Ck^Cn^{-r/2}$ is bounded by $n^{-\phi}$ for sufficiently large n.

Hence we conclude (2.73), which, as mentioned just below this equation, implies (2.58).

2.6.4. The Proof of the Limit Formula. In this subsection we will prove the limit formula in (2.59). Since we have established (2.58), we will use (2.58) and perform a slight variant of the technique in the previous subsection. However, there is an added subtlety which we now explain. Given r, let D_0 be a positive integer for which bounds the degrees of the polynomials which are the coefficients of the $P_i(k)$ over all $i = 0,\ldots,r-1$. For each $\ell \in L$, and each even, positive integer D with $D \geq D_0$, consider

$$Q_{\ell,D}(z) = \prod_{\ell'\in L\setminus\{\ell\}} (z-\ell')^D. \tag{2.74}$$

We shall apply $Q_{\ell,D}(S)$ to both sides of (2.57), the rough new ideas being:

(1) $Q_{\ell,D}(S)P_i(k)$ annihilates the part of $P_i(k)$ involving a polynomial in k times $(\ell')^k$, for any $\ell' \in L$ with $\ell' \neq \ell$;
(2) $Q_{\ell,D}(S)P_i(k)$ does not annihilate the part of $P_i(k)$ involving a polynomial in k times ℓ^k; and
(3) for μ within $n^{-\theta}$ of any $\ell' \in L$ with $\ell' \neq \ell$, we have that $Q(\mu)$ is bounded by roughly $n^{-D\theta}$.

The new ideas (1) and (2) indicate that our choice of $Q_{\ell,D}$ can isolate the ℓ^k terms in the $P_i(k)$; the new idea (3) is subtle, in that we will fix $j, r, \alpha > 0$ first, deducing a value $\theta > 0$ for which (2.58) holds, and then will we choose D sufficiently large so that $D\theta$ is large enough, compared to j.

Let us, as in the previous subsection, now fix a number of variables in a somewhat unmotivated fashion. First, we fix an $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small so that $\tau_0+\varepsilon$ is strictly less than the absolute value of any element of L. It follows that for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, we have that the closed balls of radius δ about each element of L are disjoint, and also disjoint from the set of complex numbers of absolute value at most $\tau_0+\varepsilon$. Fix an $\ell \in L$ and an integer $j \geq 1$ for which

$$p_{\ell,0}(k) = \cdots = p_{\ell,j-1}(k) = 0.$$

Let

$$\kappa = \frac{(j+2)\log(\tau_1/|\ell|)}{\log\Big(|\ell|/\big((\tau_0+\varepsilon)\big)\Big)}$$

which is non-negative, and equals zero iff $|\ell| = \tau_1$. (The illustrates the fact that the case $|\ell| = \tau_1$ is, in a sense, easier than $|\ell| < \tau_1$.) Choose α so that

$$\alpha - 1 - j - 2 > \kappa \tag{2.75}$$

and choose r so that

$$r - j - 1 > \kappa; \tag{2.76}$$

notice, since κ is a function of $j, |\ell|, \tau_1, \tau_0, \varepsilon$ that the above conditions are of the form

$$\alpha \geq G(j, L, \tau_1, \tau_0, \varepsilon),$$

and hence

$$r > F(\alpha, \varepsilon, \tau_1, \tau_0)$$

becomes a condition

$$r > H(j, L, \tau_1, \tau_0, \varepsilon)$$

for some function, H; let $\theta > 0$ be chosen so that (2.58) holds for sufficiently large n. Choose an even integer D so that

(1) D is greater than the degree of all polynomials $p_{\ell',i}$ with $i = 0, \ldots, j-1$ and $\ell' \in L \setminus \{\ell\}$, and

(2)

$$\theta D - j - 2 > \kappa. \tag{2.77}$$

Given the above, we can find a real number $\nu > 0$ for which

$$\log\Big(|\ell|/\big((\tau_0+\varepsilon)\big)\Big) > \nu - (j+2) > (j+2)\log(\tau_1/|\ell|)\min(X). \tag{2.78}$$

Where $X = \{\alpha - 1 - j - 2, r - j - 1, \theta D - j - 2\}$. Let $Q_{\ell,D}(z)$ be as in (2.74). Our strategy will be so apply $Q_{\ell,D}(S)$ to both sides of (2.57), and then choose

$$k = f(n) = \text{ the smallest even integer greater than } \nu \log n. \tag{2.79}$$

We claim that (2.59) will follow. Before going through this calculation, let us note for future use that the choice of ν as above, (2.78), shows that

$$\max(\delta^D, n^{-\alpha+1}, n^{r-1})\,\tau_1^k,\ (\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k \quad \text{are both} \quad O(n^{-j-2})\ell^k \tag{2.80}$$

where $\delta = n^{-\theta}$, for a constant in the $O(n)$ notation that is independent of n, k.

Again, we use C, C' to denote various constants that are independent of n, k, but may depend upon $L, \gamma, \ell, \tau_0, \tau_1, \varepsilon, j$, and therefore depending on $\alpha, r, \theta, D, \kappa, \nu$ as above.

We shall make some simple observations about $Q_{\ell,D}(z)$, analogous to the ones make of $Q(z)$ in the last subsection. There is only one set of new estimates, which we state as a lemma.

LEMMA 2.6.8. *The following bounds hold for, say, all $\delta \leq 1$:*

(1) if for some $\ell' \in L$ with $\ell' \neq \ell$ we have $|z - \ell'| \leq \delta$, then

$$|Q_{\ell,D}(z)| \leq (2\tau_1 + \delta)^{(|L|-2)D}\delta^D \leq C\delta^D,$$

where C is a constant independent of n, k.

(2) for any τ_0, we have that $|z| \leq \tau_0$ implies that

$$|Q_{\ell,D}(z)| \leq (\tau_0 + \tau_1)^{(|L|-1)D} \leq C,$$

where C is a constant independent of n, k.

PROOF. For (1), we see that if $\ell'' \in L$ with $\ell'' \neq \ell', \ell$, then

$$|z - \ell''| \leq |z| + |\ell''| \leq (\tau_1 + \delta) + \tau_1 = 2\tau_1 + \delta;$$

hence

$$|Q_{\ell,D}(z)| \leq |z - \ell'|^D \prod_{\ell'' \in L \setminus \{\ell,\ell'\}} |z - \ell''|^D \leq \delta^D \ (2\tau_1 + \delta)^{(|L|-2)D}.$$

For (2) we note that $\ell' \in L$ implies that

$$|z - \ell'| \leq |z| + |\ell'| \leq \tau_0 + \tau_1,$$

and (2) follows. □

We compile a list of simple observations about $Q_{\ell,D}(z)$, analogous to the ones make of $Q(z)$ in the last subsection:

(1) for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $Q_{\ell,D}(\mu)$ is real and non-negative;
(2) for any μ with $|\mu| \leq \tau_1$ we have

$$|Q_{\ell,D}(\mu)| \leq (2\tau_1)^{(|L|-1)D} \leq C \tag{2.81}$$

where C is a constant independent of n, k (by (2) of Lemma 2.6.8);
(3) $Q_{\ell,D}(\ell) \neq 0$;
(4) for real z with $|z - \ell| \leq \delta$ and $\delta \leq 1$, we have

$$Q_{\ell,D}(z) = Q_{\ell,D}(\ell) + O(\delta), \tag{2.82}$$

where the constant in the $O()$ is independent of n, k (and, in fact, depends only on L and D), which follows using the mean-value-theorem, with the $O()$ constant being any bound on the derivative $Q'_{\ell,D}(z)$ over all z within 1 of ℓ;
(5) for any real $\tau > 0$, if $h(k) = \mu^k$ with $|\mu| \leq \tau$, then

$$|Q_{\ell,D}(S)h(k)| \leq C\tau^k$$

for some C depending only on L and D; and
(6) furthermore, if $h(k)$ is any function bounded by $Ck^C\tau^k$ for some C, then we have

$$|Q_{\ell,D}(S)h(k)| \leq C'k^{C'}\tau^k$$

for a constant, C', depending only on C, L, and D.

In addition to these simple estimates, we will use Lemma 2.6.8.

Returning to Lemma 2.6.7, the goal of the rest of this subsection is to establish (2.59). As in the previous subsection, we let LHS and RHS, respectively, be the left-hand-side and right-hand-side of (2.57). Again, the basic idea is to apply $Q_{\ell,D}(S)$ to LHS = RHS. As before, we see that

$$Q_{\ell,D}(S)\text{LHS} = \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega_n}\left[\sum_i Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i(\omega)\big)\mu_i^k(\omega) \right], \tag{2.83}$$

and we wish to estimate this expectation (for various values of n, k).

For $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small (ultimately we will take $\delta = n^{-\theta}$) for each i and $\omega \in \Omega_n$ we have that exactly one of the following holds:

(1) for some $\ell' \in L \setminus \{\ell\}$ we have $|\mu_i(\omega) - \ell'| \le \delta$;
(2) we have $|\mu_i(\omega) - \ell| \le \delta$;
(3) we have $|\mu_i(\omega)| \le \tau_0 + \varepsilon$;
(4) we have

$$\mu_i(\omega) \in \mathrm{Out}(\delta, \varepsilon).$$

Assume that δ is sufficiently small for this to hold. In view of (2.83), let us estimate the contribution to the expected value of $Q_{\ell,D}(\mu)\mu^k$ for $\mu = \mu_i(\omega)$ in each of the above four cases.

For case (1), i.e., $|\mu_i(\omega) - \ell'| \le \delta$ with $\ell' \in L \setminus \{\ell\}$, use the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\left[\sum_{i\ s.t.\ |\mu_i(\omega)-\ell'|\le\delta} Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i^k(\omega)\big)\mu_i^k(\omega)\right] \le \mathrm{Near}_n(\ell',\delta)\delta^D C(\ell')^k,$$

using Lemma 2.6.8, where C is independent of n, k. Summing over all $\ell' \in L \setminus \{\ell\}$, and using the crude bound

$$\sum_{\ell'\in L} \mathrm{Near}_n(\ell',\delta) \le \gamma n,$$

we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\left[\sum_{i\ s.t.\ |\mu_i(\omega)-\ell'|\le\delta \text{ for some}\ell'\in L\setminus\{\ell\}} Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i^k(\omega)\big)\mu_i^k(\omega)\right] \tag{2.84}$$

$$\le \gamma n\delta^D(2\tau_1+\delta)^{(|L|-2)D}\max_{\ell'}(\ell')^k \le Cn\delta^D\tau_1^k,$$

where C is independent of n, k.

For case (2), i.e., $|\mu_i(\omega) - \ell| \le \delta$, with $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small, we note that

$$|\mu_i^k(\omega) - \ell^k| \le |\mu_i(\omega) - \ell|\ |\mu_i^{k-1}(\omega) + \mu_i^{k-2}(\omega)\ell + \cdots + \ell^{k-1}|$$

$$\le |\mu_i(\omega) - \ell|\, k(\tau_1+\delta)^k \le \delta k(\ell+\delta)^k = \delta k\ell^k\big(1 + (\delta/\ell)\big)^k.$$

Hence we have

$$\mu_i^k(\omega) = \ell^k\big(1 + \delta k\, O(1)\big),$$

with the $O(1)$ being at most e, provided that

$$(1/k) \ge \ell/\delta;$$

given k as in (2.79), this holds for all n sufficiently large. Then (2.82) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\left[\sum_{i\ s.t.\ |\mu_i(\omega)-\ell|\le\delta} Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i^k(\omega)\big)\mu_i^k(\omega)\right]$$

$$= \mathrm{Near}_n(\ell,\delta)Q_{\ell,D}(\ell)\big(1+O(\delta)\big)\ell^k\big(1+\delta k\, O(1)\big),$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\left[\sum_{i\ s.t.\ |\mu_i(\omega)-\ell|\le\delta} Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i^k(\omega)\big)\mu_i^k(\omega)\right] = \mathrm{Near}_n(\ell,\delta)Q_{\ell,D}(\ell)\ell^k\big(1+\delta k O(1)\big). \tag{2.85}$$

where the constant in the $O(1)$ is independent of n, k for $\delta = n^{-\theta}$ and k as in (2.79).

For case (3), (2.81) implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\left[\sum_{i\ s.t.\ |\mu_i(\omega)|\le\tau_0+\varepsilon} Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i^k(\omega)\big)\mu_i^k(\omega)\right] \le n\gamma(2\tau_1)^{(|L|-1)D}(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k \tag{2.86}$$

$$\le nC(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k \tag{2.87}$$

with C independent of n,k.

Finally, for case (4), we use the estimate

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\left[\sum_{i\ s.t.\ \mu_i(\omega)\in\mathrm{Out}(\delta,\varepsilon)} Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i^k(\omega)\big)\mu_i^k(\omega)\right]$$

$$\le n\gamma C\tau_1^k\,\mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{Exception}_n(\delta,\varepsilon)],$$

since $\mu_i(\omega)\in\mathrm{Out}(\delta,\varepsilon)$ implies that $\omega\in\mathrm{Exception}_n(\delta,\varepsilon)$, and in this case there are at most γn values of i for which $\mu_i(\omega)$ lies in $\mathrm{Out}(\delta,\varepsilon)$, and for each such i we have $Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i^k(\omega)\big)$ is at most a constant, C, by (2.81). Hence, using (2.58), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\omega\in\Omega_n}\left[\sum_{i\ s.t.\ \mu_i(\omega)\in\mathrm{Out}(\delta,\varepsilon)} Q_{\ell,D}\big(\mu_i^k(\omega)\big)\mu_i^k(\omega)\right] \tag{2.88}$$

$$\le Cn\tau_1^k n^{-\alpha}.$$

for n sufficiently large, and C independent of n,k.

Combining (2.84)–(2.88), and (2.83), we get that for $\delta=n^{-\theta}$, for all k with $k\le\ell/\delta$ and n sufficiently large we have and

$$Q_{\ell,D}(S)\mathrm{LHS}-\mathrm{Near}_n(\ell,\delta)Q_{\ell,D}(\ell)\ell^k\big(1+\delta kO(1)\big)$$

$$= O(n)\big(\delta^D\tau_1^k+(\tau_0+\varepsilon)^k+n^{1-\alpha}\tau_1^k\big), \tag{2.89}$$

where the constant in the $O(n)$ is independent of n,k. But (2.80) implies that (2.89) is $O(\ell^k n^{-j-1})$ for k as in (2.79), and hence for k as such we have

$$Q_{\ell,D}(S)\mathrm{LHS}-\mathrm{Near}_n(\ell,\delta)Q_{\ell,D}(\ell)\ell^k\big(1+\delta kO(1)\big)= O(\ell^k n^{-j-1}). \tag{2.90}$$

As in the previous subsection, we apply $Q_{\ell,D}(S)$ to RHS, and find

$$Q_{\ell,D}(S)\mathrm{RHS}=\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}Q_{\ell,D}(S)P_i(k)+O(n^{-j-1})\ell^k \tag{2.91}$$

provided that for any C independent of n,k we have

$$k^C\big(\tau_0+(\varepsilon/2)\big)^k+k^C\tau_1^k n^{-r}=O(n^{-j-1})\ell^k$$

(for the same reasoning as (2.69), (2.70), (2.68)); but this is implied by (2.80). Hence, dividing (2.91) by ℓ^k, we have

$$\begin{aligned}Q_{\ell,D}(\ell)\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}p_{\ell,i}(k)n^{-i} &= \ell^{-k}Q_{\ell,D}(S)\mathrm{RHS}+O(n^{-j-1})\\ &= \ell^{-k}Q_{\ell,D}(S)\mathrm{LHS}+O(n^{-j-1})\\ &= \mathrm{Near}_n(\ell,\delta)Q_{\ell,D}(\ell)\big(1+\delta kO(1)\big)+O(n^{-j-1})\end{aligned}$$

for k as in (2.79). Given that $p_{\ell,0}(k), \ldots, p_{\ell,j-1}$ all vanish, we have, upon dividing by $n^{-j}Q_{\ell,D}(\ell)$, that

$$p_{\ell,j}(k) + O(n^{-1}) = n^j \mathrm{Near}_n(\ell, n^{-\theta}) + O(n^{-1}).$$

But $n^j \mathrm{Near}_n(\ell, n^{-\theta})$ is independent of k, and k is proportional to $\log n$. Hence taking $n \to \infty$ we conclude (2.59).

We note that the only requirement on our choice of $\theta > 0$ is that θ satisfies (2.58) for our chosen value of α (in (2.75)). Hence if θ_0 is such a value of θ, then for any θ such that $0 < \theta < \theta_0$, then

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{Exception}_n(n^{-\theta}, \varepsilon)] \leq \mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{Exception}_n(n^{-\theta_0}, \varepsilon)] \leq n^{-\alpha},$$

for n sufficiently large. Hence any θ with $0 < \theta < \theta_0$ also satisfies (2.58) for α (in (2.75)), and hence satisfies (2.59).

2.6.5. The End of The Proof of Lemma 2.6.7. It remains to prove (2.61), having established (2.58) and (2.59). First we note that (2.59) implies that for any $\ell \in L$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ (and given $L, \gamma, \tau_0, \tau_1, j$) there is a $C > 0$ for which

$$\mathrm{Near}_n(\ell, n^{-\theta}) \leq C(n^{-j}) \tag{2.92}$$

for any fixed $\theta > 0$ for which (2.58) holds with α given in (2.75). Hence this also holds with θ replaced by any smaller, positive value of θ.

Proof of (2.61), therefore completing the proof of Lemma 2.6.7. Given an $\varepsilon > 0$, we can therefore choose a $\theta > 0$ for which

(1) for this ε, and with $\alpha = j$, we have (2.58) holds; and
(2) we have that (2.92) holds for all $\ell \in L$.

We have

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[\{\omega \mid |\mu_i(\omega) - \ell| \leq n^{-\theta} \text{ for some } i\}] \leq \mathrm{Near}_n(\ell, n^{-\theta}) \leq C\, n^{-j}$$

for a constant, C, independent of n, k. Hence, summing over all ℓ, we have

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[E_n \leq C\, n^{-j}]$$

where

$$E_n = \{\omega \mid |\mu_i(\omega) - \ell| \leq n^{-\theta} \text{ for some } i \text{ and some } \ell \in L\}.$$

Since θ also satisfies (2.58) with $\alpha = j$, we have

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{Exception}_n(n^{-\theta}, \varepsilon)] \leq n^{-j},$$

for n sufficiently large. But clearly

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{AbsoluteException}_n(\varepsilon)]$$

$$\leq \mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{Exception}_n(n^{-\theta}, \varepsilon)] + \mathrm{Prob}_n[E_n],$$

since if $\omega \in \Omega_n$ has $|\mu_i(\omega)| > \tau_0 + \varepsilon$ for some i, then either $\mu_i(\omega)$ lies in $\mathrm{Out}(n^{-\theta}, \varepsilon)$ or $\mu_i(\omega)$ is within $n^{-\theta}$ of some $\ell \in L$. Hence

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{AbsoluteException}_n(\varepsilon)]$$

$$\leq \mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{Exception}_n(n^{-\theta}, \varepsilon)] + \mathrm{Prob}_n[E_n] \leq Cn^{-j}.$$

□

2.7. Proof of the Relativized Alon Conjecture

This section is devoted to completing the proof of Theorem 0.2.6, for base graphs, B, without half-loops; Theorem 0.1.1 for regular base graphs, B, without half-loops will easily follow. Chapter 3 has variants of this result when B contains half-loops, for other models related to the Broder-Shamir model, and weaker results for non-regular B.

First, let us explain why Theorem 0.1.1 follows for any regular B for which Theorem 0.2.6 holds. If G is d-regular, then any non-real eigenvalue of G has absolute value $(d-1)^{1/2}$, by (0.9) and the discussion below this equation. It follows that for any regular graph, B, we can take $\tau_0 = \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$, and all the hypotheses of Theorem 0.2.6 are satisfied. Hence the conclusion of Theorem 0.2.6 holds, which is just Theorem 0.1.1.

Proof of Theorem 0.2.6, for B without half-loops. (And therefore of Theorem 0.1.1, for B without half-loops.)

According to Theorem 2.4.2, for any r, the set of minimal tangles of order less than r is finite; since the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of the Hashimoto matrix of a cycle equals 1, any such minimal tangle is a connected graph of order at least one. It follows from Theorem 2.5.2 that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\ \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\ \big] = p_1 n^{-1} + p_2 n^{-2} + \ldots + p_{1-r} n^{-r+1} + O(n^{-r}) \tag{2.93}$$

for any r; in fact it follows that $p_1 = \ldots = p_j = 0$ if the smallest order of tangle is $j+1$. From Theorem 2.1.1, if follows that for any integer $r > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\ \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G) H_G^k\ \big] = P_0(k) + P_1(k) n^{-1} + \cdots + P_{r-1}(k) n^{1-r} + \mathrm{err}_r(n,k), \tag{2.94}$$

where the $P_i(k)$ are B-Ramanujan, and there is a C independent of n, k for which

$$|\mathrm{err}(n,k)| \le C k^{2r+2} \rho(H_B)^k n^{-r}. \tag{2.95}$$

Theorem 1.3.4 implies that, up to the error term, the principle part of P_0 is given by

$$P_0(k) = \mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)$$

(say by taking $k, n \to \infty$ with $k \ll \log n$). It follows that

$$\mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\left[\ \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G) \sum_{\mu\in \mathrm{Spec}_B^{\mathrm{new}}(H_G)} \mu^k\ \right] \tag{2.96}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\Big[\ \mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}(G)\Big(\mathrm{Tr}(H_G^k) - \mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)\Big)\ \Big] \tag{2.97}$$

$$= \widetilde{P}_0(k) + \widetilde{P}_1(k) n^{-1} + \cdots + \widetilde{P}_{r-1}(k) n^{1-r} + \mathrm{err}_r(n,k), \tag{2.98}$$

where

$$\widetilde{P}_i(k) = P_i(k) + p_i \,\mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k), \tag{2.99}$$

and where

$$|\mathrm{err}(n,k)| \le C k^{2r+2} \rho(H_B)^k n^{-r}.$$

In particular, the $\widetilde{P}_i(k)$ are B-Ramanujan functions with bases $\mathrm{Spec}(H_B)$, and the principle part of $\widetilde{P}_0(k)$ vanishes.

We now wish to apply the side-stepping-lemma, Lemma 2.6.7. So choose an arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$. Consider the following abstract partial trace $(\tau_0, \tau_1, C', L, r)$, where:

(1) τ_0 as in the hypothesis of Theorem 0.2.6;
(2) $\tau_1 = (\tau_0)^{1/2}$;
(3) L is the set of Hashimoto eigenvalues of B (it suffices to take those of absolute value greater than τ_1);
(4) we choose any r with

$$r > H(1, L, \tau_1, \tau_0, \varepsilon) \tag{2.100}$$

with H as in (2.60);
(5) γ is the $\alpha = \alpha(r)$ in the conclusion of Theorem 2.1.1
(6) $C' = C'(r)$ is a constant for which
   (a) each error term of the $\widetilde{P}_i(k)$ is bounded in absolute value by by
   $$C'\big(\tau_0 + \varepsilon/2\big)^k$$
   (which is possible since $\tau_0 \geq \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$); and
   (b) the error term bound in (2.95) is at most
   $$C' k^{2r+2} \rho(H_B)^k n^{-r}$$
   for all k, n with $1 \leq k \leq \gamma n^\gamma$

   (the existence of such a $C' = C'(r)$ is guaranteed by Theorem 2.1.1) and
(7) the $\mu_i = \mu_i(G)$ are random variables ranging over $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ given by the *new eigenvalues* of H_G over H_B.

It is easy to verify then that the hypotheses (1)–(3) of Lemma 2.6.7 are satisfied; hence we may apply this lemma. The last part of the lemma can be applied with $j = 1$ in the lemma, since the principle part of $\widetilde{P}_0(k)$ vanishes; hence we conclude that

$$\mathrm{Prob}_n[\mathrm{AbsoluteException}_n(\varepsilon)] \leq C_\varepsilon n^{-1},$$

in the language of Definition 2.6.6. However, the event

$$\mathrm{AbsoluteException}_n(\varepsilon)$$

is just the event that $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has a new Hashimoto eigenvalue of absolute value at least $\tau_0^{1/2} + \varepsilon$. Hence we conclude Theorem 0.2.6.

□

CHAPTER 3

Generalizations and Further Directions

In this chapter we give a number of generalization and refinements of Theorem 0.1.1 and the proof techniques of Chapter 2. In Section 3.1 we prove a result regarding the new adjacency eigenvalues of graphs that are not regular. In Section 3.2 we prove some results about the *spreading* (a type of expansion property) of elements of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$; in Section 3.3 we use these spreading estimates to prove Theorem 0.1.3. In Section 3.4 we discuss the case where B may have half-loops, and some variants of the Broder-Shamir model, $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, to which are theorems apply. In Section 3.5, we explain that some of the lower order coefficients of our $1/n$-asymptotic expansions have, at least for certain B, well defined polyexponential-type terms of the form $p(k)(d-1)^{k/2}$ for k even, and $q(k)(d-1)^{(k-1)/2}$ for k odd; these coefficients would be interesting to compute; in principle such terms can be computed with our techniques, although we do not know how easy it is to make such computations. In Section 3.6 we conclude with some possible future directions for research.

3.1. Irregular Graphs

In this section we make prove Theorem 0.2.7. This follows from Theorem 0.2.6 and the following theorem of Kotani and Sunada, in [**KS00**].

THEOREM 3.1.1. *Let G be a graph whose maximum degree is $d_{\max}$. Then any non-real eigenvalue of H_G has absolute value at most $\sqrt{d_{\max}-1}$.*

Their proof is short and clever: take the inner product of the equation $(\mu_2 - \mu A_G + (D_G - I))v = 0$ with v, and divide by $|v|^2$; their result follows from the fact that this quadratic equation in μ has constant term equal to the Rayleigh quotient of v for the matrix $D_G - I$, which is clearly bounded by $d_{\max} - 1$. See [**KS00**] for details.

PROOF OF THEOREM 0.2.7. Since each vertex of $\mathrm{Line}(B)$ has degree at most $d_{\max} - 1$, we have $\rho(H_B) \leq d_{\max} - 1$. We now apply Theorem 0.2.6 with $\tau_0 = d_{\max} - 1$. □

3.2. Spreading in Random Covers of Regular Graphs

If B is d-regular, then, in Chapter 2, we have identified the probability that a random cover in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has new adjacency eigenvalues of absolute value greater than $2(d-1)^{1/2} + \epsilon$ in terms of the principle part of the coefficients of certain $1/n$-asymptotic expansions. It turns out that the contribution of the bases $d-1$, and $1-d$ if B is bipartite, can be understood via the notion of γ-*spreaders*, in Chapter 12 of [**Fri08**]; the exact same notion is called a γ-*expander* in [**Fri91**] in Lemma 3.1, and this notion plays the same role in both papers.

In Section 3.3 these results will be crucial to the proof of Theorem 0.1.3; the basic point is that if B is Ramanujan, then the only bases contributing to the coefficients of the $1/n$-asymptotic expansions are $\pm(d-1)$, we which understand via spreading.

Our goal in this section is to prove the following two theorems.

THEOREM 3.2.1. *Let B be a connected, d-regular graph with $d \geq 3$. Then for any integer, $j > 0$, there exists an $\epsilon > 0$, $C > 0$, and an integer r such that*

(1) if B is not bipartite, then the probability that $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ in contains no connected component of fewer than r vertices and has

$$|\lambda_i(G)| \geq d - \epsilon$$

for some $i > 1$ is at most Cn^{-j}; and

(2) if B is bipartite, then the same is true with the condition "$i > 1$" replaced with "$i \neq 1, |V_G|$" (when B is bipartite, then G automatically has an eigenvalue equal to $-d$).

The idea behind the proof is to fix a spanning tree, T, for B. Then we reduce spreading in B to spreading in the graph, $B[T]$, which is B where T is *contracted* to a single vertex; the graph $B[T]$ has one vertex, and edges $E_B \setminus E_T$. Then information regarding spreading in random covers of $B[T]$, which was essentially established in [**Fri08**], easily establishes spreading in B.

We will need some results on d-regular graphs that are slightly stronger results than those of [**Fri91**], but that follow from the methods there. So we will review all the terminology and proofs there. We will use these results to establish spreading theorems for $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for any d-regular B.

3.2.1. Spreaders.

DEFINITION 3.2.2. Let G be a graph, and $A \subset V_G$. We define the *neighbourhood of A*, denoted $\Gamma_G(A)$, to be the subset of V_G consisting of those vertices joined by an edge of G to a vertex of A.

DEFINITION 3.2.3. Say that a d-regular graph, G, on n vertices is a *γ-spreader* if for every subset, A, of at most $n/2$ vertices we have

$$|\Gamma_G(A)| \geq (1+\gamma)|A|.$$

THEOREM 3.2.4. *Let G be a d-regular γ-spreader. Then for all $i > 1$ we have*

$$\lambda_i^2(G) \leq d^2 - \frac{\gamma^2}{4+2\gamma^2}.$$

PROOF. See [**Fri08**]; this is a pretty easy consequence of Alon's work on *magnifiers* [**Alo86**]. □

DEFINITION 3.2.5. Let G be a graph and $k \geq 1$ an integer. By the *graph of k-length walks in G*, denoted $G[k]$, we mean the graph whose vertices are V_G, and whose edges are walks of length k in G, with the tail of the edge the first vertex in the walk, and the head of the edge the last vertex of the walk. Hence $A_{G[k]}$, the adjacency matrix of $G[k]$, is just A_G^k. Also, if G is d-regular, then $G[k]$ is d^k-regular.

COROLLARY 3.2.6. *Let G be a d-regular graph, and k a positive integer. Then if $G[k]$ is a γ-spreader, then for all $i > 1$ we have*

$$\lambda_i^{2k}(G) \leq d^{2k} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4 + 2\gamma^2}.$$

PROOF. Apply Theorem 3.2.4 to $G[k]$. □

3.2.2. Preliminary Lemmas. In this subsection we give some general, simple facts in graph theory and spreading to be used later.

LEMMA 3.2.7. *Let B be a connected graph with at least one edge. Fix a vertex, $v \in V_B$. Then*

1. *for any even integer, $k \geq 0$, there is a closed walk of length k originating and terminating in v;*
2. *B is bipartite iff every closed walk originating and terminating in v has even length;*
3. *if B is not bipartite, then there exists a closed walk originating and terminating in v of odd length, k, with $k \leq 2|V_B|$.*

PROOF. Item (1): v is incident upon some edge e; if e is a self-loop, we may traverse it k times; otherwise we may traverse e back and forth $k/2$ times.

Item (2) is standard: the "if" direction is clear. The "only if" directions follows because B is connected: every $v' \in B$ is connected to v by a walk of some length, and all walks from v' to v must have the same parity. This parity gives a bipartition of the vertices.

Item (3) is also standard: by Item (2), there exists a closed walk of odd length. Let w be a closed walk of minimum odd length in V_B; then w is of length at most $|V_B|$, since if a vertex of V_B occurs twice in a closed non-backtracking walk (we count the occurrence of the first and last vertex in the closed walk as a single occurrence), then the walk breaks into two non-backtracking walks, one of which must be of odd length. Let w' be a walk of minimum length from v to a vertex of w; the length of w' is at most $|V_B| - \text{length}(w)$. Then the walk $(w')^{-1}ww'$ is a closed walk of odd length, originating and terminating in v, of length at most $2|V_B|$. (This bound is tight when B consists of a single "path" plus a self-loop at one of its endpoints.) □

COROLLARY 3.2.8. *Let B be a connected graph with at least one edge. Then*

$$A \subset \Gamma_G^2(A) \subset \Gamma_G^4(A) \subset \cdots \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_G^1(A) \subset \Gamma_G^3(A) \subset \cdots$$

PROOF. This follows from Item (1) of the lemma above. □

LEMMA 3.2.9. *Let G be a d-regular graph, with $d \geq 1$. Then for all $A \subset V_G$ we have*

$$|A| \leq |\Gamma_G(A)|,$$

and equality holds iff the subgraph of G induced on the vertex subset $A \cup \Gamma(A)$ is disconnected from the rest of G.

PROOF. For each A, $\Gamma_G(A)$ can be described as the heads of all directed edges whose tail lies in A, or, the same with "head" and "tail" interchanged.

Let E_A be the set of directed edges whose tail lies in A. Then $|E_A| = d|A|$. Any vertex occurs as a head of edges in E_A at most d times. Hence

$$|\Gamma_G(A)| \geq |E_A|/d \geq |A|.$$

If the above holds with equality, then each vertex in $\Gamma_G(A)$ is the head of d elements of E_A. It follows that $\Gamma_G^2(A)$ which is the set of vertices appearing as a tail of an edge whose head lies in $\Gamma_G(A)$, is precisely A; by repeating this argument (or just by applying Γ_G repeatedly) we conclude that

$$A = \Gamma_G^2(A) = \Gamma_G^4(A) = \cdots \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_G^1(A) = \Gamma_G^3(A) = \cdots$$

Hence all edges with tails or heads in the set of vertices $A \cup \Gamma_G(A)$ have both their tails and heads in this set. □

COROLLARY 3.2.10. *Let G be a regular graph, and $A \subset V_G$. If for a real $\gamma \leq 1/|A|$ we have*

$$|\Gamma(A)| < |A|(1+\gamma),$$

$|\Gamma(A)| = |A|$, and $A \cup \Gamma(A)$ is disconnected from the rest of G.

3.2.3. Spreading in Random Graphs. Now we wish to show that random covers of graphs with be spreaders. The proofs of Theorems 12.3 and 12.4 of [**Fri08**] imply some slightly stronger theorems that we will need. Hence we will state these strengthenings and outline their proofs. Here is the strengthening of Theorem 12.3 that we need here.

DEFINITION 3.2.11. We say that a graph, B, is a *bouquet of self-loops*, if B has one vertex; hence E_B consists entirely of self-loops. Specifically, by the *bouquet of i whole-loops and j half-loops* we mean the bouquet of self-loops with i whole-loops and j half-loops; in this case, B is $(2i+j)$-regular, and $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is a model of a random, $(2i+j)$-regular graph.

THEOREM 3.2.12. *Let B be a bouquet of self-loops such that the degree of the vertex in B is at least three. Let s be any positive integer. The there exists an integer m and a real $\gamma > 0$ such that the following is true: the probability, $E(n, 2m, \gamma, B)$, that an element of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has no connected component of at most $2m$ vertices and is not a γ-spreader, is at most n^{-s} for all n sufficiently large.*

This theorem is a slight improvement of Theorems 12.2 and 12.3 in [**Fri08**]; it is also more general, since [**Fri08**] proves this only for a bouquet which is either entirely whole-loops or half-loops. However, the above theorem follows easily from the methods used in the proofs Theorems 12.2 and 12.3 in [**Fri08**]. For ease of reading, we will summarize the main points there; we will also correct a minor error there. We shall prove the above theorem in stages: first for a bouquet of whole-loops, and then mixture of whole-loops and half-loops.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2.12 IN THE CASE OF A BOUQUET OF WHOLE-LOOPS. So fix B, a bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops, where $d \geq 4$ is an even integer.

By Corollary 3.2.10, as long as

$$1/\gamma \geq m,$$

we can estimate the probability $E(n, 2m, \gamma)$ in the statement of the theorem by bounding the probability that there exist subsets $A, B \subset \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that for $d/2$ random permutations $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_{d/2}$ (used to form an element of $\mathcal{C}_n(W_{d/2})$) we have

$$m \leq |A| \leq n/2, \quad |B| \leq \lfloor A(1+\gamma) \rfloor, \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma(A) \subset B.$$

So fix A, B with $|A|, |B|$ as above. Let $C_1 = A \cap B$, $C_2 = A \setminus B$, $C_3 = B \setminus A$, and let $c_i = |C_i|$. Let π be π_i for some $i = 1, \ldots, d/2$, i.e., a random, uniformly

chosen element of S_n. For let r be the number of elements of C_1 that π maps to elements of C_1. It then follows that π maps $c_1 - r$ values of C_1 to C_3, and $c_1 - r$ values of C_3 to C_1, c_2 values of C_2 to C_3, and c_2 values of C_3 to C_2; if the C_i and r are fixed, then the probability of this is exactly

$$p = p(c_1, c_2, c_3, r) = \left[\binom{c_1}{r}^2 r! \right] \left[\binom{c_3}{c_1 - r} (c_1 - r)! \right]^2 \times$$

$$\left[\binom{c_3 - c_1 + r}{c_2} c_2! \right]^2 [n(n-1)\cdots(n - 2c_1 - 2c_2 + r + 1)]^{-1}$$

(for details see the proof of Theorem 12.2 in [**Fri08**]). So let r_i be the number of elements that π_i maps to C_1. Let

$$b = b(c_1, c_2, c_3, r, n) = \binom{n}{c_1, c_2, c_3, n - c_1 - c_2 - c_3},$$

representing the number of choices of C_1, C_2, C_3 with fixed sizes c_1, c_2, c_3. Since each of c_1, c_2, c_3 take at most n values and similarly for each of $r_1, \ldots, r_{d/2}$ (assuming $n \geq 2$ so that $1 + (n/2) \leq n$), we have that probability of this happening is at most $n^{3+(d/2)}$ times the maximum value of $bp^{d/2}$ over all choices of c_i and r_i, i.e.,

$$E(n, r, \gamma) \ \leq n^{3+(d/2)} \max_{c_i, r} [b(c_1, c_2, c_3, n)\ p^{d/2}(c_1, c_2, c_3, r)]$$

where the maximum is over all c_1, c_2, c_3 yielding A and B of appropriate size, i.e.,

$$c_1 + c_2 = a, \quad c_1 + c_3 = a + \lfloor \gamma a \rfloor, \quad r \leq c_1,$$

for some a with

$$1/\gamma \leq a \leq n/2$$

(there are $d/2$ values $r_1, \ldots, r_{d/2}$, but for a given c_1, c_2, c_3, the function p takes its maximum at some value r). (We remark that in [**Fri08**] the fact that there are more than one r_i appears to be missed, although this only affects the $E(n, r, \gamma)$ estimate by a constant power of n.)

At this point we write b and p above in terms of factorials, and use Stirling's approximation. Namely, we have

$$b = \frac{n!}{c_1!\ c_2!\ c_3!\ (n - c_1 - c_2 - c_3)!}$$

and

$$p = \frac{(c_1!\ c_3!)^2\ (n - 2c_1 - 2c_2 + r)!}{\big((c_1 - r)!\ (c_3 - c_1 - c_2 + r)!\big)^2\ r!\ n!},$$

and approximating $m!$ by $(m/e)^m$ changes each factorial by a multiple of at most a constant times $\sqrt{m}$; these factors, like the n^5 for c_1, c_2, c_3, r_1, r_2, can be absorbed into n^{-s} by adding a constant to s.

The remarkable aspect this approach is that if one sets

$$\nu_i = c_i/n, \quad \delta = \lfloor \gamma n \rfloor / n,$$

then one has

$$\frac{\log b}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{-\log p}{n}$$

are both (!)

$$= h(\nu_1, \nu_2) + O\left(|\delta \log \delta| + \frac{\log n}{n} \right),$$

where

$$h(\nu_1,\nu_2) = -\nu_1\log\nu_1 - 2\nu_2\log\nu_2 - (1-\nu_1-2\nu_2)\log(1-\nu_1-2\nu_2)$$

(see equation (63) in [**Fri08**]). This coincidence of $\log b$ and $-\log p$ is indicative of the fact that with one permutation, i.e., a d-regular graph with $d=2$, one never gets a spreader, but with $d\geq 4$ one does. From there one shows that

$$h(\nu_1,\nu_2) \geq -(\alpha/2)\log(\alpha/2),$$

where $\alpha = a/n = (c_1+c_2)/n$ to conclude that bp^2 is can be made smaller than any give power, $n-s$, of n, provided that $a\geq m$ for $m=m(s)$ sufficiently large. One concludes the theorem, for $r=2m$ and $\gamma = 1/(2m)$. See [**Fri08**] for details. □

The above theorem is sufficient for the case where B is d-regular without half-loops.

Proof of Theorem 3.2.12 in the general case. This follows from the above methods plus a calculation in the proof of Theorem 12.3 of [**Fri08**]. For half-loops and n even, we replace p as above with

$$\tilde{p} = \tilde{p}(\{c_i\},r,n) = \left[\binom{c_1}{r} r!_{\text{odd}}\right]\ \left[\binom{c_3}{c_1-r}(c_1-r)!\right] \times \left[\binom{c_3-c_1+r}{c_2} c_2!\right]\ \frac{(n-2c_1-2c_2-r)!_{\text{odd}}}{n!_{\text{odd}}}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $m!_{\text{odd}}$ is the odd factorial:

$$m!_{\text{odd}} = (m-1)(m-3)\cdots 3 = \frac{m!}{2^{m/2}(m/2)!}, \tag{3.2}$$

and where Stirling's approximation implies one can replace $m!_{\text{odd}}$ with $(m/e)^{m/2}$. The same analysis shows, again remarkably, that

$$\frac{-\log\tilde{p}}{n} = (1/2)h(\nu_1,\nu_2) + O\left(|\delta\log\delta| + \frac{\log n}{n}\right),$$

where the ν_i, δ are as before, and h is the exact same function (!) as before. Hence the same calculation shows that for $2i+j\geq 3$ we have $bp^i(\tilde{p})^j$ is less than any fixed power of n.

For n odd, there is one fixed point, which takes on a specific value from $\{1,\dots,n\}$ with probability $1/n$, and then $\tilde{p}$ is the same, up to an additive difference of one in the c_i and r, with n replaced by $n-1$ in (3.1). Hence the same conclusions hold, by absorbing the j $1/n$'s into the s of n^{-s}. □

Theorem 3.2.12 remains true in certain modifications of the model $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. Let us give one example.

Corollary 3.2.13. *Theorem 3.2.12 also holds for the model of random graph where $d\geq 4$ is an even integer and $d/2$ permutations are chosen from among those permutations whose cyclic structure is that of a single cycle.*

Proof. Every single cycle occurs in $\mathcal{S}_n$ with probability $1/n$, and so $d/2$ independent permutations are all cycles with probability $1/n^{d/2}$. So any event occurring in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ with probability n^{-s} can occur in the single cycle model with probability at most $n^{-s+(d/2)}$. □

3.2.4. Spreading in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for non-bipartite B. Now we will establish spreading for graphs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. In this section we work with non-bipartite B. Our spreading results easily imply Theorem 3.2.1 for B not bipartite.

We remark that if B is bipartite, then any G which admits a covering map to B (or even a graph morphism to B) is bipartite, and hence has $-d$ as an eigenvalue. It follows from Theorem 3.2.4 that any bipartite graph cannot be a γ-spreader for any value of B.

Our basic strategy is as follows: with notation as in Corollary 3.2.6, for a graph, G, let $\Gamma^k(A)$ be the vertices connected to a vertex in A by a path of length k; then

$$\Gamma^k_G(A) = \Gamma_{G[k]}(A).$$

Now let $\pi\colon G \to B$ is be a covering map of degree n, and $A \subset \pi^{-1}(v)$ for a vertex $v \in V_B$; if B is connected, and k is even, then

$$A \subset \Gamma^k_G(A).$$

It follows that $G[k]$ will be a spreader if we can show that for any $A \subset V_G$, there is some $v \in V_B$ such that

$$\left|\left(\Gamma^k_G(A_v) \cap \pi^{-1}(v)\right) \setminus A_v\right| \geq \theta|A|, \tag{3.3}$$

where $A_v = A \cap \pi^{-1}(v)$ and $\theta > 0$ is a real number depending only on B.

Second, if T is a spanning tree in B, then setting B/T to be the graph where we *contract* B along T, then B/T has one vertex, and a random $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ gives rise to a random, regular graph which is a cover of degree at least 3 over B/T. Then the fact that such a random, regular graph is a spreader will be seen to imply that $G[k]$ is a spreader for any

$$k \geq 2|V_B|.$$

Let us begin with the first part of our strategy: we state the first part above, and then give a slightly more useful form of this statement.

LEMMA 3.2.14. *Let $\pi\colon G \to B$ be covering map of a d-regular graphs, with B not a bipartite graph. Let $q \geq 2|V_B|$ be an odd integer, and $m > 0$ is an integer. Assume that for some $\theta > 0$ the following is true: for any $v \in V_B$, and any $A_v \subset \pi^{-1}(v)$, we have that if $m \leq |A_v| \leq n/2$ then*

$$|\Gamma^q_G(A_v) \cap \pi^{-1}(v)| \geq |A_v|(1+\theta). \tag{3.4}$$

Then either

1. *G has a connected component of size at most $2m|V_B|$; or*
2. *$G[q+1]$ is a γ-spreader for any γ such that*

$$\gamma < \min\Big(1/(m|V_B|), 1/\big(4|V_B|^2\big), \theta/(4|V_B|), \theta/(8|V_B|^2)\Big). \tag{3.5}$$

(Of course, the fourth expression in the above min *is always smaller than the third expression, but it will be convenient to leave both in for ease of reading.)*

PROOF. By (3.5)

$$\gamma < 1/(m|V_B|);$$

but by Corollary 3.2.10 this implies that if $A \subset V_G$ has $|A| \leq m|V_B|$, then either

$$|\Gamma_G(A)| \geq |A|(1+\gamma)$$

or else G has a connected component of size at most $2m|V_B|$.

Hence to prove the theorem, it suffices to show that if $A \subset V_G$ and $m|V_B| \leq |A| \leq |V_G|/2$, then

$$|\Gamma_G(A)| \geq |A|(1+\gamma).$$

So consider

$$f(v) = |\pi^{-1}(v)|$$

as v varies over all vertices in B; let $v_{\max}$ be a vertex where f attains its maximum, and $v_{\min}$ one where f attains its minimum. Since B is connected, there exists a walk from $v_{\max}$ to $v_{\min}$,

$$v_0 = v_{\max}, e_1, v_1, \ldots, v_{r-1}, e_r, v_r = v_{\min},$$

where $r+1 \leq |V_B|$ (if a vertex, v, appears twice in the walk, we can discard the segment of the walk between the first and last appearance of v). If r is odd, then by walking along a closed walk of odd length about $v_{\min}$ we may assume that in the above walk we have $r \leq 3|V_B|$ and r is even.

We claim that if there is a path of length two in B from $v \in V_B$ to $v' \in V_B$, then

$$\left|\Gamma_G^2(A) \setminus A\right| \geq f(v) - f(v');$$

indeed, if this path has edges e_1e_2, then in a permutation assignment $\sigma\colon E^{\mathrm{dir}} \to \mathcal{S}_n$ we have $\sigma(e_2)\sigma(e_1)$ takes the vertex fibre of A over v to a set of vertices over v' of size $f(v)$. Applying the same argument from v' to v shows that

$$\left|\Gamma_G^2(A) \setminus A\right| \geq |f(v) - f(v')| \ .$$

Hence for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, r-2$ we have

$$\left|\Gamma_G^2(A) \setminus A\right| \geq |f(v_i) - f(v_{i+2})|.$$

For at least one value of $i = 0, 2, \ldots, r-2$, we must have

$$|f(v_i) - f(v_{i+2})| \geq |f(v_{\max}) - f(v_{\min})|/(r/2) \geq |f(v_{\max}) - f(v_{\min})|(2/3)(1/|V_B|).$$

Hence

$$|\Gamma_G^2(A)| \geq |A|(1+\delta_A), \tag{3.6}$$

where δ_A is defined by

$$|A|\delta_A \leq |f(v_{\max}) - f(v_{\min})|/(2|V_B|). \tag{3.7}$$

Since G is d-regular, we have that

$$|\Gamma_G^i(A)| \leq |\Gamma_G^{i+1}(A)|$$

for any i. It follows that

$$|\Gamma_G^{q+1}(A)| \geq |A|(1+\delta_A).$$

This gives us a lower bound for $|\Gamma_G^k(A)|$ if δ as above is bounded away from zero. Let us give a bound for $|\Gamma_G^k(A)|$ when δ above is small. Assuming that $m|V_B| \leq |A| \leq |V_G|/2$, we have

$$m \leq |A|/|V_B| \leq n/2.$$

Since the average value of $f(v)$ over all vertices is $|A|/|V_B|$, we have

$$f(v_{\min}) \leq |A|/|V_B| \leq f(v_{\max}).$$

Since

$$|f(v_{\max}) - f(v_{\min})| = |A|\delta_A 2|V_B|,$$

for those A with

$$\delta_A \leq 1/(4|V_B|^2) \tag{3.8}$$

we have

$$|f(v_{\max}) - f(v_{\min})| \leq (1/2)|A|/|V_B|,$$

and hence

$$(1/2)(|A|/|V_B|) \leq f(v_{\min}) \leq |A|/|V_B| \leq f(v_{\max}) \leq (3/2)(|A|/|V_B|). \tag{3.9}$$

Hence we have

$$f(v_{\max}) \leq 3f(v_{\min}).$$

It follows that either

$$f(v_{\min}) \geq m$$

or

$$f(v_{\max}) \leq 3m.$$

Hence if $m \leq n/6$, then either $v = v_{\min}$ or $v = v_{\max}$ satisfies

$$m \leq f(v) \leq n/2,$$

and

$$f(v) \geq (1/2)(|A|/|V_B|).$$

By (3.4) applied to $A_v = A \cap \pi^{-1}(v)$, we have

$$|\Gamma_G^q(A) \cap \pi^{-1}(v)| \geq |A_v|(1+\theta) = f(v)(1+\theta). \tag{3.10}$$

Now take any vertex, v', joined to v by an edge (we can take $v' = v$ if v is incident upon a self-loop). We get

$$|\Gamma_G^{q+1}(A) \cap \pi^{-1}(v')| \geq f(v)(1+\theta).$$

Since q is odd, $A \subset \Gamma_G^{q+1}(A)$. It follows that

$$|(\Gamma_G^{q+1}(A) \setminus A) \cap \pi^{-1}(v')| \geq f(v)(1+\theta) - f(v').$$

Hence

$$|\Gamma_G^{q+1}(A)| = |A| + |\Gamma_G^{q+1}(A) \setminus A| \geq |A| + f(v)(1+\theta) - f(v').$$

Now we have

$$f(v)(1+\theta) - f(v') \leq f(v)(1+\theta) - f(v_{\max}) \leq f(v)\theta - \big(f(v_{\max}) - f(v)\big), \tag{3.11}$$

which by (3.7) is at least

$$f(v)\theta - |A|\ 2\ |V_B|\ \delta_A.$$

Hence

$$|\Gamma_G^{q+1}(A)| \geq |A|(1 - 2|V_B|\ \delta_A) + f(v)\theta,$$

which by (3.9) is at least

$$|A|(1 - 2|V_B|\ \delta_A) + (1/2)(|A|/|V_B|)\theta = |A|\big(1 + (1/2)(\theta/|V_B|) - 2|V_B|\ \delta_A\big). \tag{3.12}$$

This last expression is at least

$$|A|(1+\gamma),$$

provided that

$$\gamma \leq \theta/(4|V_B|) \quad \text{and} \quad 2|V_B|\ \delta_A \leq \theta/(4|V_B|).$$

By (3.5) the first inequality holds; if the second inequality doesn't hold, then

$$\delta_A \geq \theta/(8|V_B|^2),$$

and we can apply (3.6) to conclude that

$$|\Gamma_G^{q+1}(A)| \geq |\Gamma_G^2(A)| \geq |A|(1+\delta_A) \geq |A|\big(1+\theta/(8|V_B|^2)\big),$$

which is at least $|A|(1+\gamma)$ by (3.5). □

The second part of our strategy uses a spanning tree in B to reduce spreading in covers of B to spreading in regular graphs. Recall that we define the Euler characteristic in graphs, B, which may have half-loops as

$$\chi(B) = |V_B| - |E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}|/2.$$

LEMMA 3.2.15. *Let B be a connected graph (which may have half-loops) with negative Euler characteristic. For any integer $t > 0$, there is a $\theta > 0$ and an integer $r > 0$ such that for sufficiently large n the following is true: with probability at least $1 - n^{-t}$ we have that a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ satisfies at least one of the following properties:*

(1) G has a connected component with fewer than r vertices; or
(2) we have that for every $v \in V_B$, any set $A_v \in \pi^{-1}(v)$ with $m \leq |A_V| \leq n/2$ satisfies (3.4) holds any odd $q > 6|V_B|$.

PROOF. Since B is connected, B has a spanning tree, i.e., a subgraph $T \subset B$ that is a tree (so T has no self-loops) containing each vertex of B.

Let $B[T]$ be the contraction of B along T, i.e., the graph with one vertex, and whose directed edge set is $E_B^{\mathrm{dir}} \setminus E_T^{\mathrm{dir}}$, with all heads and tail maps taken to the single vertex of $B[T]$, and with the edge involution being the restriction of the involution of B (so all the half-loops in B occur as half-loops in $B[T]$, and all the whole-loops in B and the edges not in E_T^{dir} occur in $B[T]$ as whole-loops). We have

$$|E_{B[T]}^{\mathrm{dir}}| = |E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}| - |E^{\mathrm{dir}}(T)| = |E_B^{\mathrm{dir}}| - 2|V_B| + 2 = 2 - 2\chi(B) \geq 3.$$

Hence $B[T]$ is a bouquet of self-loops of degree $d \geq 3$.

A graph $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ arises from a permutation assignment $\sigma\colon E_B^{\mathrm{dir}} \to \mathcal{S}_n$. For each $e \in E_T^{\mathrm{dir}}$ fix an arbitrary value for $\sigma(e)$, and for $e \in E_{B[T]}$ we view the $\sigma(e)$ as a random variable (a permutation or involution). We now wish to relate spreading of the random $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ arising σ (on all of E) to that of a random regular graph.

Fix a "base point," $v_0 \in V_B$. For any $v \in V_B$, there is a unique non-backtracking walk in T from v_0 to v,

$$w(v) = (v_0, e_1, \ldots, e_k, v_k = v).$$

To each $e \in E_{B[T]}$, we may view e an edge in E_B, with head $h_B(e)$ and tail $t_B(e)$, and we associate to e the associated walk

$$\tilde{a} = \tilde{a}(e) = w(t_B(e))ew(h_B(e))^{-1}$$

which is a closed walk from v_0 to itself. Since B is not bipartite, at least one of the $\tilde{a}(e)$ must be of odd length; so fix an e_0 such that $\tilde{a}(e_0)$ is of odd length, and let

$$a(e) = \begin{cases} \tilde{a}(e) & \text{if the length of } a(e) \text{ is odd, and} \\ \tilde{a}(e_0)\tilde{a}(e) & \text{if the length of } a(e) \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

Let us extend σ from a function on E_B^{dir} to a function on any walk in B the natural way: namely, if w is a walk whose successive edges are

$$e_1, \ldots, e_k$$

we set

$$\sigma(e_1, \ldots, e_k) = \sigma(e_k) \cdots \sigma(e_1),$$

where the permutations act on the left (which is why their order is reversed).

Our first claim is that if we fix permutations $\sigma(e)$ over all $e \in E_T$, then the $\sigma(a(e))$, viewed as random variables over $\sigma(e)$ for $e \in E_{B[T]}$, are independent, and are involutions or permutations, according to whether or not e is a half-loop or not. Indeed, view the variables $\sigma(a(e))$ as being determined by first fixing $\sigma(e)$ for $e \in E_{B[T]}$ with $\tilde{a}(e)$ for odd length, and then fixing the rest of the values of σ. If e is self-loop, then $t_B(e) = h_B(e)$, so

$$\tilde{a}(e) = wew^{-1}$$

for some walk w for which $\sigma(w)$ is a permutation (any walk in T consists of edges that are not half-loops) has been determined; then $\tilde{a}(e)$ is of odd length, and so $\tilde{a}(e) = a(e)$; it follows that if e is a half-loop, then $\sigma(a(e))$ is a uniformly chosen involution. Otherwise if $\tilde{a}(e)$ is odd, then

$$a(e) = \tilde{a}(e) = w_1 e w_2^{-1},$$

where the permutations $\sigma(w_1)$ and $\sigma(w_2)$ have been fixed, and so $a(e)$ is uniformly chosen among all permutations. Furthermore, the $\sigma(a(e))$ for $\tilde{a}(e)$ odd is determined by $\sigma(e)$, and all these $\sigma(e)$ are independent. If we fix all such $\sigma(e)$, then the remaining $a(e)$ are of the form

$$a(e) = \tilde{a}(e_0) w_1 e w_2^{-1},$$

where σ has been determined on $\tilde{a}(e_0)$ and on w_1 and w_2; hence $\sigma(a(e))$ is a random permutation (all e that are self-loops have $\tilde{a}(e)$ of odd length) depending only on $\sigma(e)$, and hence the remaining $\sigma(a(e))$ are independent. It follows that for fixed $\sigma(e)$ with $e \in E_T$, each $\sigma(a(e))$ takes on each permutation or involution with the same probability, and hence the $\sigma(a(e))$ are independent.

It follows that any $v_0 \in V_B$ and any permutation assignment $\sigma\colon E_B \to \mathcal{S}_n$ we associate a d-regular graph, $\widetilde{G}(v_0)$, with $d \geq 3$, according to the distribution $\mathcal{C}_n(B[T])$ It follows from Theorem 3.2.12 that with t fixed, there is an m and a $\theta > 0$ such that for sufficiently large n we have with probability at least $1 - n^{-t}$ that $\widetilde{G}$ has a connected component of no more than $2m$ vertices, or is a θ-spreader. From the union bound it follows that this condition holds for all $\widetilde{G}(v_0)$, ranging over all $v_0 \in V_B$, with probability at least $1 - |V_B| n^{-t}$.

If for any v_0 we have that $\widetilde{G}(v_0)$ has a connected component on a set of vertices, V', then it follows that the vertex subset of $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ whose v fibre is $\sigma(w(v))V'$ is a connected component of G, of size $|V_B|\ |V'|$. Hence, with probability $1 - |V_B| n^{-t}$ (for sufficiently large n) either (1) $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has a connected component with at most $|V_B|\ 2m$ vertices, (2) each graph $\widetilde{G}(v_0)$ is a θ-spreader. So assume condition (2) holds.

If $A_v \subset \pi^{-1}(v)$ with $r \leq |A_v| \leq n/2$, then we have

$$U = \bigcup_{e \in E_{B[T]}} \sigma(a(e)) A_v$$

is of size at least $|A_v|(1+\theta)$, and lies in $\pi^{-1}(v)$ and in $\Gamma_G^q(A)$ for any odd q larger than the longest length among the walks $a(e)$; since this length is at most that of $\tilde{a}(e_0)$ plus that of $\tilde{a}(e)$, this length is at most $6|V_B|$. Hence if q is any odd number greater than $6|V_B|$, we have (3.4) is satisfied. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2.1 FOR B NOT BIPARTITE. Immediate from Lemmas 3.2.14 and 3.2.15 and Corollary 3.2.6. □

3.2.5. Spreading in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for bipartite B. In this subsection we briefly describe the modifications needed to the proof in the last subsection for B bipartite.

Of course, if B is bipartite then any $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is bipartite, and therefore $-d$ occurs as an eigenvalue. Hence, by Corollary 3.2.6, there is no k for which $G[k]$ is a γ-separator for any $\gamma > 0$.

Let B be a connected, bipartite graph, which therefore has an essentially unique partition $V_B = V_1 \amalg V_2$ (unique up to exchanging V_1 with V_2) of its vertices so that E_B has no self-loops, and each directed edge of B has a head or tail in each of V_1 and V_2. In this case $B[2]$ has exactly two connected components, B_1 and B_2, which are the subgraphs induced on the edge sets V_1 and V_2 respectively. For any $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(G)$ with $\pi\colon G \to B$ the covering map, we have that $G[2]$ has naturally divides into two d-regular graphs, $G_i = \pi^{-1}(B_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$.

The same arguments as in the previous subsection can be applied to a subset $A \subset V_{G_1}$ with $m \leq |A| \leq |V_{G_1}|/2$ with the following modifications:

(1) In Lemma 3.2.15 we replace q odd with q even; all the $\tilde{a}(e)$ are of even length, and we take $a(e) = \tilde{a}(e)$ for all $e \in E_{B[T]}$.

(2) We claim that Lemma 3.2.14 holds with q replaced by an even integer (and one can replace the second claim about $G[q+1]$ with the (stronger) claim regarding $G[q]$); indeed, we follow the exact same proof until (3.10); then we note that $A \subset \Gamma^q_G(A)$ since q is even, and hence

$$|\Gamma^q_G(A) \cap \pi^{-1}(v)| \geq |A_v|(1+\theta) = f(v)(1+\theta)$$

implies that

$$|(\Gamma^q_G(A) \cap \pi^{-1}(v)) \setminus A| \geq |A_v|\theta = f(v)\theta$$

since $A \cap \pi^{-1}(v) = A_v$. From there we have

$$|\Gamma^q_G(A)| = |A| + |\Gamma^q_G(A) \setminus A| \geq |A| + f(v)\theta,$$

which is the same estimate as in (3.11) except that the $f(v_{\max}) - f(v)$ doesn't appear, meaning that we have

$$|\Gamma^q_G(A)| \geq |A|\big(1 + (1/2)(\theta/|V_B|)\big)$$

which is an improvement over (3.12). Hence the estimates which suffice to prove that this quantity is at least $|A|(1+\gamma)$ in Lemma 3.2.14 for q odd, must also hold here, for $|\Gamma^q(A)|$ and q even.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2.1 FOR B BIPARTITE. Let B be a connected, bipartite graph; let V_1 and V_2 be a (the essentially unique) bipartition of B's vertices; for each $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ and $i = 1, 2$, let G_i be the subgraph of $G[2]$ induced from those vertices of G lying over V_i. From the above modified versions of Lemmas 3.2.14 and 3.2.15, we have that for any t there are integers r, q and $\gamma > 0$ with q even such that the following holds for n sufficiently large: for $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, we have that with probability at least $1 - |V_B|n^{-t}$ that $G_1[q/2]$ and $G_2[q/2]$ are both γ-spreaders or else G has a connected component with fewer than r vertices. Now we apply Corollary 3.2.6. □

3.3. The Fundamental Order and Ramanujan Bases

If B is d-regular and Ramanujan we can give upper and lower bounds on

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\ \rho_B^{\mathrm{new}}(A_G)\geq \rho(A_{\widehat{B}})+\epsilon\ \big],$$

that are optimal to within a multiplicative constant. Note that in [**Fri08**], the upper and lower bounds differed by a factor of n is certain "exceptional" cases, namely for the Broder-Shamir over the base $W_{d/2}$, for even values of d for which $\sqrt{d-1}$ is an odd integer (e.g., $d=10$). Hence this result gives an improvement on [**Fri08**], even just in the case of d-regular graphs, for some values of d.

Recall the definition of $\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$, the fundamental order of B, of Definition 2.4.8, namely

$$\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)=\min\{\mathrm{ord}(L)\mid \rho(H_L)>\rho^{1/2}(H_B)\},$$

i.e., the smallest order of a strict tangle of B.

By the discussion of (1.13), we see that if ψ is (isomorphic to) a subgraph of G, then

$$\rho(H_G)\geq\rho(H_\psi)=\rho^{1/2}(H_B)+\epsilon_0$$

for some $\epsilon_0>0$. Hence, by Theorem 2.4.7 we conclude the following simple observation.

PROPOSITION 3.3.1. *Let B be a connected graph with no half-loops. Then there is an $\epsilon_0=\epsilon_0(B)>0$ and a $C=C(B)>0$ for which*

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\{\rho(H_G)\geq\rho^{1/2}(H_B)+\epsilon_0\}\geq Cn^{-\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)}.$$

To get a matching upper bound, to within a constant, we shall prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.3.2. *Let B be a connected graph with no half-loops, and assume B is d-regular for some $d\geq 3$. Then for every $\epsilon>0$ with*

$$\epsilon<(d-1)-(d-1)^{1/2}$$

there is a $C=C(\epsilon)$ for which

$$\mathrm{Prob}_{G\in\mathcal{C}_n(B)}\{\rho(H_G)\geq\rho^{1/2}(H_B)+\epsilon\}\leq C(\epsilon)n^{-\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)}.$$

PROOF. We follow the proof of Theorem 0.2.6 in Section 2.7, except that we will replace the set of B-tangles, Tangle_B, with the set of (B,ϵ)-tangles.

So fix an $\epsilon>0$ and an integer $r>0$; $\mathrm{TF}(r,B,\epsilon)$ be the set of graphs which contain no subgraphs in $\mathrm{Tangle}_{<r,B,\epsilon}$, and let $\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B,\epsilon)}$ be its indicator function. Let p_i, P_i, and $\widetilde{P}_i$, respectively, be as in (2.93), (2.94), and (2.99), respectively, with $\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B)}$ replaced with $\mathbb{I}_{\mathrm{TF}(r,B,\epsilon)}$. Now we consider the abstract partial trace (τ_0,τ_1,C',L,r) as described after these equations, except that τ_0 is specifically $\rho(H_B)+\epsilon$ and that we replace the choice of r in (2.100) we choose

$$r>\max\big(H(1,L,\tau_1,\tau_0,\varepsilon),r_0\big)$$

where r_0 is the value in Theorem 3.2.1 with j in the theorem taken to be $\tau_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$.

Now it suffices to show that

$$\widetilde{P}_1,\widetilde{P}_2,\dots,\widetilde{P}_{\tau_{\mathrm{fund}}-1}$$

have vanishing principle parts.

On the contrary, assume that $\widetilde{P}_j$ does not vanish for some $j < \tau_{\text{fund}}$, and consider the minimum value of such a j. In this case, Lemma 2.6.7 implies that

$$\widetilde{P}_j(k) = (1-d)^k p_{1-d,j} + (d-1)^k p_{d-1,j}$$

for some constants $p_{1-d,j}, p_{d-1,j}$, at least one of which is positive.

But by Theorem 3.2.1 as applied above, there is an $\epsilon > 0$ such that for sufficiently large n we have the following: with probability at least $1 - n^{-\tau_{\text{fund}}(B)}$ we have that a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ either has a connected component of size less than $r_0 < r$ above, or else we have

$$|\lambda_i(G)| < d - \epsilon$$

for all $i \neq 1$ or all $i \neq 1, |V_G|$, according to whether or not B is bipartite. If G has a connected component on fewer than r vertices, then this connected component is a tangle (assuming $(d-1)^{1/2} + \varepsilon < d$). Otherwise we have

$$|\lambda_i(G)| < d - \epsilon$$

for appropriate i described above, with probability asymptotically less than n^{-j}. In this case we have the eigenvalues of H_B, excepting one eigenvalue of $d-1$, and one eigenvalue $1-d$ if B is bipartite. Hence $p_1 = \cdots = p_j = 0$ and

$$\text{Prob}_n[\text{AbsoluteException}_n(\varepsilon)] \leq C_\varepsilon n^{-\tau_{\text{fund}}(B)}.$$

This contradicts the fact that one of $p_{1-d,j}$ or $p_{d-1,j}$ must be positive. □

In the next subsection we wish to make some remarks on the fundamental order of a graph, B. The most important of these remarks is that for a given B there is a finite algorithm to compute $\tau_{\text{fund}}(B)$.

3.3.1. Computing The Fundamental Order. We begin by giving a finite algorithm to determine the fundamental order, $\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)$, of a graph B.

PROPOSITION 3.3.3. *For any connected graph, B, with no half-loops, for which* $\text{ord}(B) \geq 1$, *there is a finite procedure to determine $\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)$, and $\eta_{\text{fund}}(B) \geq 1$. In other words, there is a Turing machine which halts on every input, and when input the description of a graph, B, with no-half loops, outputs $\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)$.*

PROOF. Since $\rho(H_B) > \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$, and since the identity map $B \to B$ is étale, we have that $\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)$ is at most $\text{ord}(B) - 1$.

If $L \to B$ is étale, consider the *type*, $T = T(L)$ of L, meaning (since L is a graph, not a walk) the information consisting of the graph one obtains by contracting all the beaded paths of L. It suffices to consider, for all (the finitely many) types of underlying graph, T, with $\text{ord}(T) < \text{ord}(B)$, whether there is an étale $L \to B$ of type T and with $\rho(H_L) > \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$. For any $L \to B$ of type T, let $\vec{k} = \vec{k}(L)$ be, as usual, be the vector indexed on E_T giving the length of the beaded path in L corresponding to the edge $e \in E_T$. Of course, L is isomorphic to the graph $\text{VLG}(T, \vec{k})$.

We claim that if there is étale $L \to B$ with $L = \text{VLG}(T, \vec{k})$ and $\rho(H_L) > \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$, then there is another such graph, $L' = \text{VLG}(T, \vec{k})$, with an étale map to B, for which each component, $k(e)$, of $\vec{k}$, satisfies $k(e) \leq |V_B|$. Indeed, let $\pi \colon L \to B$ be the étale map. If along some beaded path of L, if the image via π in B of the path encounters some vertex, v, twice, we may delete the part of the beaded path between any two occurrences of v. Hence, by repeated deletions, we obtain an étale

$\pi' \colon L' \to G$, isomorphic to $\mathrm{VLG}(T, \vec{k}')$ with $\vec{k}' \leq \vec{k}$, and with each beaded path having no two occurrences of a V_B vertex under π'. Hence $\vec{k}'(e) \leq |V_B|$, and

$$\rho(H_{L'}) = \rho(H_{\mathrm{VLG}(T,\vec{k}')}) \geq \rho(H_{\mathrm{VLG}(T,\vec{k})}) > \rho^{1/2}(H_B).$$

Hence it suffices to consider for a finite number of graphs, T, all possible morphisms $\mathrm{VLG}(T, \vec{k}) \to B$, for a finite number of vectors, $\vec{k}$, and to examine which morphisms are étale, and what the values of $\rho(H_{\mathrm{VLG}(T,\vec{k})})$.

The only technical point of this algorithm is that we have to be able to determine whether or not $\rho(H_{\mathrm{VLG}(T,\vec{k})})$ is strictly greater than $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$. But

$$\rho(H_{\mathrm{VLG}(T,\vec{k})}) - \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$$

is an algebraic integer for which we can obtain bounds on the degree and coefficients of its minimal equation. This gives a positive lower bound on its value if its value is positive, and we can use a standard algorithm to approximate the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of a matrix with non-negative entries to test the positivity. □

We remark that, in practice, one can often give simpler calculations to determine $\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$, such as $B = W_{d/2}$ for an even positive integer, d. For example, the arguments in [**Fri08**] show that for any positive integer $m \leq d/2$, the smallest value of $\rho(H_L)$ among those graphs of order m that admit an étale map to $W_{d/2}$ is attained for $L = W_m$. (This is easy.) It follows that $\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(W_{d/2})$ is $m-1$ where m is the smallest positive integer for which $2m - 1 > \sqrt{d-1}$.

We note that similar remarks are valid for many models of random covering graphs of degree n over a fixed base graph, B. In [**Fri08**], $\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$, is computed in a number of such models, although the calculation is a bit more involved. One interesting remark is that if we use a model where each permutation is restricted to a cycle of length n (the model called $\mathcal{H}_{n,d}$ in [**Fri08**]), then self-loops are impossible, and the minimal $\rho(H_L)$ for a graph, L, of order m (with $m \leq d-1$) which admits an étale map to $W_{d/2}$, is a graph with two vertices joined by $m+1$ edges. This gives an $\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$ which is roughly twice that of the Broder-Shamir model. In particular, two simple and natural models can have very different $\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B)$.

3.3.2. Lower Bound on the Fundamental Order of a d-Regular Graph. It is interesting to note that the fundamental order of a d-regular graph is always greater than roughly $\sqrt{d}$. This means that as d gets large, Theorem 0.1.3 gives progressively sharper bounds on the probability of a graph in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ does not satisfying the bound in the Relativized Alon Conjecture for any d-regular graph, B.

THEOREM 3.3.4. *Let B be any d-regular, connected graph, possibly with half-loops. Then*

$$\eta_{\mathrm{fund}}(B) > \sqrt{d-1};$$

furthermore, this bound is tight when B is an appropriate bouquet of half-loops.

Our proof follows that in Chapter 6, Section 3 of [**Fri08**]. We briefly recall the proof.

PROOF. First we show that if ψ is a connected graph with at least two vertices, then there exists a graph, ψ', with one vertex fewer than ψ such that ψ' and ψ have the same order, but

$$\rho(H'_\psi) \geq \rho(H_\psi).$$

(This is Lemma 6.7 in [**Fri08**].) Indeed, let e be a directed edge of ψ whose head and tail are distinct. Let ψ_e be the graph with e discarded and the head and tail of e identified (i.e., discard $t_\psi e$, and redefine the heads and tails maps in ψ_e so that any edge with head or tail equal to $t_\psi e$ now has it equal to $h_\psi e$.). Then ψ_e has the same Euler characteristic as ψ. However, to any strictly non-backtracking closed walk, c, in ψ, if we discard all appearances of e we get a strictly non-backtracking closed walk, c', in ψ_e of the same length or less; furthermore this association is injective, since from the associated non-backtracking closed walk, c', in ψ_e we can infer when e was traversed. Hence the number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks of length at most k in ψ is at most the same in ψ_e, and hence

$$\rho(H_{\psi_e}) \geq \rho(H_\psi).$$

It follows that the largest $\rho(H_\psi)$ over all graphs of order s is attained by some graph, ψ, with one vertex and $s+1$ edges. But any such graph has $\rho(H_\psi) = s$. Hence, if

$$\rho(H_\psi) > (d-1)^{1/2},$$

then the order of ψ satisfies

$$s > (d-1)^{1/2}.$$

Furthermore, if s is the smallest integer greater than $(d-1)^{1/2}$, and ψ is the bouquet of $s+1$ half-loops, then this bound is attained. □

3.4. Algebraic Models

In this section we describe a number of variants of the Broder-Shamir model to which all our theorems. We shall not try to give an "all encompassing" definition of such models; rather we explain that all these models have an "algebraic" feature which allows us to express the certified trace (and related traces) in a $(1/n)$-power series expansion.

At this point we claim that the theorems in Chapter 2 hold when B has half-loops in the Broder-Shamir model of Definition 1.1.22, as well as numerous related models. Rather than characterizing a large class of such models, which would probably be rather awkward, we content ourselves to give some examples that illustrate the diversity of possible models.

We also note that once the Alon conjecture is established for one model of a random covering of degree n of a graph, B, then it is automatically established for any other model that is *contiguous* with the model for which the conjecture is proven However, despite a large body of knowledge on contiguity results for models of a random d-regular graph on a large number of vertices (see, for example, [**Fri08**], the discussion just after Theorem 1.3), there appears to be much less known about random coverings; see [**GJR10**] for some work in this direction. We thank Nick Wormald for these remarks and discussions regarding contiguity of random covering maps.

3.4.1. Theorems 0.1.1 and 0.1.3 for General Base Graphs. Here we indicate the modifications needed to prove Theorems 0.1.1 and 0.1.3 for d-regular graphs, B, which may have half-loops. Since Theorem 3.2.1 was proven in the case where B may have half-loops, it suffices to prove Theorem 0.2.6 for graphs with half-loops.

Let us discuss what theorems can be easily modified for B with half-loops. The case where n is even is simplest, where the half-loops in B yield involutions with no fixed points. Let us begin with this case.

3.4.1.1. *$\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for even n.* If $e \in E_B$ is a half-loop, then in a permutation assignment $\sigma\colon E_B \to \mathcal{S}_n$, $\sigma(e)$ is an involution with no fixed points, according to our definition of the Broder-Shamir model. In this case if $\sigma(e)(i) = j$ then $\sigma(e)(j) = i$; in this case when we fix values of $\sigma(e)$ we fix k values for k even, and these k values occur with probability

$$\frac{(n-k)!_{\text{odd}}}{n!_{\text{odd}}} = (n-1)(n-3)\dots(n-2k+1),$$

where $!_{\text{odd}}$ denotes the odd factorial of (3.2).

The odd factorial is the essential modification. We remark that since n is even, all the graphs occurring in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ have no half-loops; this slightly simplifies matters. It is important to note that a non-backtracking walk in a graph with half-loops is not allowed to traverse a half-loop twice; this is only relevant to walks in B, since $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ do not have half-loops, and to traverse a half-loop twice in B corresponds to taking an edge and its inverse in G (which means that such a walk in G would not be non-backtracking in our usual definition of non-backtracking for walks in graphs without half-loops). Let us indicate which parts of the proof of Theorem 0.2.6 need modification:

(1) Section 1.3: Theorem 1.3.3 goes through with similar estimates, with

$$\Big(n(n-1)\dots(n-k'+1)\Big)^{-1}$$

replaced with

$$\Big((n-1)(n-3)\dots(n-k'+1)\Big)^{-1}$$

for k' odd. Coincidences are defined exactly in the same way. Lemma 1.3.5 also holds; the only modification is that a walk of length k can fix up to $2k$ values of an involution; hence we want $1/(n-2k)$ to be of order $1/n$, which requires us to restrict k to be, say, at most $n/3$ instead of $n/2$.

(2) Subsection 2.2.1 requires the following modifications: of course, as mentioned in just above Lemma 3.2.15, we set

$$\chi(B) = |V_B| - |E_B^{\text{dir}}|/2$$

and we define the degree of a vertex, $v \in V_B$, as the number of directed edges whose heads are v; hence a half-loop contributes one to the degree, and whole-loops contribute two, and the degree is always an integer. We still define B to be pruned if each vertex has degree two, and work only with pruned graphs. Note that if B has more than one vertex and is connected, then any vertex, v, with a half-loop is of degree at least two, since the half-loop contributes one to the degree of v, and v must have an edge connecting v to a different vertex of B.

(3) Section 2.3 goes through until Proposition 2.3.8, where we remark that, as remarked there, one replaces factorials with odd factorials. We still get expansion polynomials, albeit different polynomials for the half-loops, as in Definition 2.3.9. Types and forms are defined in the same way; since n is even the graphs of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ have no half-loops.

(4) To Section 2.5.6: Proposition 2.5.6 requires odd factorials for the half-loops.
(5) The side-stepping lemma, Lemma 2.6.7, is used as is, along with the loop calculation, namely Theorem 1.3.4, to prove Theorem 0.2.6.

3.4.1.2. *$\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for odd n.* For n odd we have that any half-loop, $e \in E_B$, a permutation assignment, $\sigma\colon E_B \to \mathcal{S}_n$, for our definition of the Broder-Shamir model, requires $\sigma(e)$ to be an involution with exactly one fixed point. It is best to view this as two pieces of information, (1) which $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is fixed, and (2) the values of such a $\sigma(e)$ on the $n-1$ remaining values. To give the fixed point of such a $\sigma(e)$ is a probability $1/n$ event, and to fix k values of the remaining $n-1$ values of $\sigma(e)$ can be done, given the fixed point, in

$$(n-2)(n-4)\dots(n-2k) \tag{3.13}$$

ways. If we do not condition upon the fixed point of $\sigma(e)$, then fixing k of the values of $\sigma(e)$ not involving the fixed point can be done in

$$(n-1)(n-3)\dots(n-2k+1) \tag{3.14}$$

ways. Therefore a graph in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ has exactly one half-loop for each half-loop in E_B. Then the type should remember all half-loops it traverses (so that we only delete vertices of degree two of the type which are not the starting vertex and are not half-loops). A non-backtracking walk in B and G cannot traverse a half-loop twice (however, a non-backtracking walk in B and G can traverse an edge, e, then a half-loop, e', and then e^{-1}); it follows that in our VLG's, the half-loop will always have length one and always remains unchanged. For this reason the type should remember the half-loops encountered in a walk.

It follows that all expansions for types will involve either (3.14) or (3.13), according to whether or not the walk traverses the fixed point of $\sigma(e)$. The same is true of Ω-types, according to whether or not the walk traverses the fixed point or the B-graph Ω includes the fixed point.

3.4.2. Some Examples of Algebraic Models. In this subsection we give examples of other "algebraic models" of random coverings of B of degree n to which Theorems 0.1.1 and 0.1.3 hold. Roughly speaking, this should hold of any model of random permutation assignments, $\sigma\colon V_B \to \mathcal{S}_n$, such that the $\sigma(e)$ are independent (modulo the fact that they respect the involution of V_B), and where we have power series in $1/n$ to describe the probabilities that certain values of $\sigma(e)$ are fixed. We remark that we could allow for some dependence between the $\sigma(e)$, but only in a fairly simple (and algebraic) way. Rather than classify a large number of examples, which does not seem that important at present, we will suffice to give a few examples.

One interesting example is when we modify $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ so that edges, $e \in E_B$, that are not half-loops, have $\sigma(e)$ only in the permutations whose cyclic structure is a single cycle of length n. As shown in [**Fri08**], at least for the bouquet of whole-loops, this decreases the fundamental exponent of B by roughly a factor of two. The reason is that this model does not allow for half-loops, and, at least for B being the bouquet of $d/2$ whole loops, the smallest tangles have two vertices rather than one (in the case of $\sigma(e)$ being an arbitrary permutation).

A similar modification would be where we specify a given cyclic structure of $\sigma(e)$ as a finite union of cycles, each of whose length is either constant or, say, a

linear function of n. In this case we consider, for types and Ω-types, each cycle on its own. For example, we could insist that certain of the $\sigma(e)$ would consist of a cycle of length 3, one of length 4, and two cycles of length $(n-7)/2$, assuming that n is odd. We see no reason to be interested in such a model. We remark, however, that our model of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, for n odd and B containing half-loops, does require special values of $\sigma(e)$, namely an odd number of fixed points.

One related model that may be of interest is that we could fix the values of some of the $\sigma(e)$; i.e., we could insist that $\sigma(e)$ for one e takes 1 to 5 and 7 to 9, and something else for some other other values of σ; any such model, provided that we can write power series for the various types, would work.

We also point out that the $\sigma(e)$ can have dependence, but only in a way that yields algebraic coefficients for the expansion polynomials. For example, we could take two different edges, $e, e' \in E_B$, not inverses of each other and not half-loops, and insist that, say, for one value of $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have $\sigma(e)(i) = \sigma(e')(i)$, and otherwise choose the rest of $\sigma(e)$ and $\sigma(e')$ independently. This makes these two σ values dependent, but only on a mild way. Again, in the types and Ω-types we would keep track of this special value of i and $\sigma(e)(i) = \sigma(e')(i)$, provided that it occurs on the walk or the B-graph Ω. And again, we don't see any particular application of such a model at present, but this does point out that—strictly speaking—the values of $\sigma(e)$ for e that are not inverses of one another can have some weak dependence.

3.5. Mod-S Functions

In this subsection we give a refined notion of polyexponential functions that, at least in principle, may give more detailed information about trace methods that could be used, say, to test conjectures about finer aspects of the trace method.

Recall from Example 2.2.13 the weighted convolution example of $g_1(k) = g_2(k) = (d-1)^k$, with

$$(g_1 * g_2)_{1,2}(k) = \begin{cases} \big((d-1)^{k+1} - (d-1)^{k/2}\big)/(d-2) & \text{if } k \text{ is even,} \\ \big((d-1)^{k+1} - (d-1)^{(k-1)/2}\big)/(d-2) & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

It follows that this weighted convolution is not exactly a polyexponential. In Chapter 2, specifically Theorem 2.2.14, we pointed out that such convolutions are B-Ramanujan functions. In this section we take an alternate point of view: namely, $(g_1 * g_2)_{1,2}(k)$ as above has an exact formula, provided that we are willing to write one formula for k even, and another for k odd.

In this section we show that, more generally, a weighted convolution will have an exact formula provided that we divide its argument by congruence classes modulo S, where S is the least common multiple of the weights; we call such functions *mod-S polyexponentials*. Furthermore, we indicate why such formulas may be of interest in future research.

In the next subsection we prove the basic facts about mod-S polyexponentials. In the subsection thereafter, we explain our interest in such functions and their formulas.

3.5.1. Mod-S Polyexponentials.

Definition 3.5.1. Let S be a positive integer. We say that a function $g = g(k)$ defined on the non-negative integers is *mod-S polyexponential of base ℓ* if there

are polyexponential functions, $p_0, \dots, p_{S-1}$ and an integer K such that for any $i = 0, \dots, S-1$ we have

$$g(k) = p_i\big((k-i)/S\big) \quad \text{if } k \geq K \text{ and } k \equiv i \pmod{S},$$

where each $p_i(k)$ is a polynomial in k times ℓ^k. By a *mod-S polyexponential* we mean any finite sum of mod-S polyexponentials, and by the *bases* of this sum we mean the set of bases involved in the sum.

Clearly for any integer, s, any mod-S polyexponential of base ℓ is a mod-sS polyexponential of base ℓ^s.

The main goal of this section is to prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.5.2. *Let $g_1, \dots, g_t$ be polyexponential functions with bases L, let $m_1, \dots, m_t$ be positive integers, and let S be the least common multiple of $m_1, \dots, m_t$. Then*

$$(g_1 * g_2 * \cdots * g_t)_{\vec{m}}(k)$$

is a mod-S polyexponential with bases the union over $i = 1, \dots, t$ of

$$L^{S/m_i} = \{\ell^{S/m_i} \mid \ell \in L\}.$$

PROOF. The proof of this theorem is based on the following fundamental lemma.

LEMMA 3.5.3. *For $i = 1, 2$, let g_i be a mod-S polyexponential of base ℓ_i. Then*

$$(g_1 * g_2)(k)$$

is a sum of mod-S polyexponentials of bases ℓ_1 and ℓ_2.

PROOF. By the linearity of the convolution operator, it suffices to prove this theorem under the assumption that for some i_1, i_2, we have

$$g_j(k) = \begin{cases} p_j\big((k-i_j)/S\big) & \text{if } k \equiv i_j \pmod{S}, \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see that

(1) we may assume that $K = 0$, since modifying g_1 at a single value k_0 modifies the convolution by a term of the form $g_2(k-k_0)$, which is a mod-S polynomial with base ℓ_2; similarly for any finite number of modified g_1 values, and similarly for modifying any finite number of g_2 values;
(2) it suffices to compute the convolution for k divisible by S (the other cases of k modulo S are similar).
(3) we may assume that $i_1 = i_2 = 0$ (the other cases are similar);

So assume k is divisible by S, that $K = 0$, and that $i_1 = i_2 = 0$. Then

$$(g_1 * g_2)(k) = \sum_{t=0}^{k/S} g_1(tS) g_2(k - tS) = \sum_{t=0}^{k/S} p_1(t) p_2\big((k/S) - t\big)$$

$$= (p_1 * p_2)(k/S).$$

Hence, for k divisible by S, Theorem 2.2.6 implies that this is a sum of a polyexponential of k/S in the bases ℓ_1, ℓ_2. Hence, considering k of any residue class modulo S, $(g_1 * g_2)(k)$ is a mod-S polyexponential with bases ℓ_1 and ℓ_2. □

As a corollary of the lemma, it follows that the convolution of any (finite) number of mod-S polyexponentials with bases L is again such a mod-S polyexponential.

Returning to the proof of Theorem 3.5.2, consider polyexponentials $g_1, \ldots, g_t$ with bases L, and $\vec{m} \geq \vec{1}$. Let S to be the least common multiple of the m_i. For $i = 1, \ldots, t$ the functions

$$\tilde{g}_i(k) = \begin{cases} g_i(k/m_i) & \text{if } m_i \text{ divides } k, \text{ and} \\ 0\text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

are mod-m_i polyexponentials with bases L, and hence are mod-S polyexponentials with bases L^{S/m_i}. Since

$$(g_1 * g_2 * \cdots * g_s)_{\vec{m}}(k) = (\tilde{g}_1 * \cdots * \tilde{g}_s)(k),$$

Theorem 3.5.2 follows. □

3.5.2. Strongly Ramanujan Graphs.

DEFINITION 3.5.4. Let B be a d-regular graph and $m \geq 2$ an integer. We say that B is *m-strongly Ramanujan* if the Hashimoto eigenvalues of B, excepting $d-1$ and the possible eigenvalue $-d+1$ all have absolute value strictly less than $(d-1)^{1/m}$.

For example, B is 2-strongly Ramanujan if B is Ramanujan and has no eigenvalue equal to either $\pm 2\sqrt{d-1}$. For another example, consider any d-regular graph, B, on one vertex, i.e., a bouquet of m_1 whole-loops and m_2 half-loops with $2m_1 + m_2 = d$ (e.g., $W_{d/2}$, the bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops, or H_d, the bouquet of d half-loops). Then B has eigenvalues $d-1$ and ± 1 (by direct calculation or by (1.1)). Hence any such B is m-strongly Ramanujan for any integer $m \geq 2$.

DEFINITION 3.5.5. We say that a function $f = f(k)$ is m-strongly B-Ramanujan if f is the sum of a mod-S polyexponential functions, for some integer, S, plus an error term which for every $\epsilon > 0$ is bounded by

$$C\big(\rho(H_B) + \epsilon\big)^{k/m}.$$

The same estimates used to prove Theorem 2.1.3 can be modified to prove the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.5.6. *Let B be a d-regular graph and $m > 0$ an integer for which B is m-strongly Ramanujan. Let t be the smallest order among those feasible B-graphs, ψ, for which*

$$\rho(H_\psi) > \big(\rho(H_B)\big)^{1/m}.$$

Then the coefficients in (2.4) *are m-strongly B-Ramanujan functions. Furthermore, the coefficients of order less than t are the same coefficients in the $1/n$-asymptotic expansion of*

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\ \mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)\ \big].$$

For example, if B is any d-regular, then the proof of Theorem 3.3.4 shows that the above theorem we have

$$t > (d-1)^{1/m}.$$

It follows, for example, that if B is a bouquet of self-loops of degree d, then the coefficients of

$$\mathbb{E}_{G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)}\big[\ \mathrm{Tr}(H_B^k)\ \big]$$

to any order of at most $(d-1)^{1/m}$ are m-strongly Ramanujan. In particular, for $m = 3$, we see that the coefficients are mod-2 polyexponential functions plus an $O(d-1)^{(k+\epsilon)/3}$ error term. The proof of Theorem 0.1.3 implies that the base $d-1$ term vanishes for the coefficients of order less than $\tau_{\text{fund}}(B) > (d-1)^{1/2}$. It follows that these coefficients functions given by

$$(d-1)^{k/2}p_i(k/2) \quad \text{or, respectively,} \quad (d-1)^{(k-1)/2}q_i\big((k-1)/2\big)$$

for k, respectively, even or odd. It may be interesting to determine these coefficients, as these coefficients contain (at least in principle) information about the distribution of H_B eigenvalues.

3.6. Remarks for Future Directions

In this section we make remarks for possible future research on the Relativized Alon Conjecture.

3.6.1. Weighted Hashimoto Matrices. In this subsection describe some possible generalizations of Theorem 0.2.6 to what we call *weighted versions* of the Hashimoto matrix.

Definition 3.6.1. Let M be a matrix with non-negative entries. By a *weighted version* of M we mean any matrix, $\widetilde{M}$, of the same dimensions as M, and with non-negative entries, such that for each i, j we have

$$M_{ij} = 0 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \widetilde{M}_{ij} = 0.$$

If $\pi\colon G \to B$ is a covering map, and $\widetilde{H}_B$ is a weighted version of H_B, then we define its *weighted pullback*, $\widetilde{H}_G$, to be the weighted version of H_G with weights induced from B in the natural way: namely, for each $e, e' \in E_G$ with $(H_G)_{e,e'} \neq 0$, we set

$$(\widetilde{H}_G)_{e,e'} = (H_B)_{\pi(e),\pi(e')}.$$

We similarly define a weighted pullback of a weighted version of A_B.

It seems likely that Theorem 0.2.6 will generalize to weighted versions, $\widetilde{H}_B$, of H_B, under some conditions. As an example of a condition, it seems that the case where $\rho(\widetilde{H}_B) < 1$ would need some care, for then $(\widetilde{H}_B)^k$ does not dominate $(\widetilde{H}_B)^{k/2}$, and this may cause problems in our expansion theorems and/or side-stepping lemmas.

Since, at present, we have no use for the generalization to weighted Hashimoto matrices, we will not pursue such theorems here. However, such theorems could give a lot of spectral information related to the adjacency matrix and/or weighted versions of the adjacency matrix. Perhaps one could use such information to improve our results on the Relativized Alon Conjecture when the base graph, B, is not regular.

3.6.2. Direct Adjacency Matrix Traces. Another way to attack the Relativized Alon Conjecture when the base graph, B, is not regular, would be to try to adapt our methods to directly estimate the expected values of powers of the adjacency matrix of a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$. This is the approach taken by Puder in [**Pud12**]. If we look at the graph of a closed walk in G that does not need to be non-backtracking, then part of the theory carries over without much difficulty: namely, we can define

coincidences in the same way as before, and we get can understand the number of coincidences encountered in terms of the order of the walk.

However, our methods, arising from those of Broder-Shamir [**BS87**], seem to require some new idea(s) in order to work. Namely, fix the graph, $G' = \mathrm{Graph}(w)$, of a walk, w, in G that is allowed to backtrack. The computation of how many walks are compatible with G' seems difficult, because the edge multiplicities could differ for each edge. So it is not clear if there is a "modified" adjacency trace for which we can prove a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion to arbitrarily large order. We remark, however, that Puder [**Pud12**] obtains enough information about such expansions, for each such G', to get a high probability new adjacency spectral bound of less than $1 + 2(d-1)^{1/2}$; yet, without modifying adjacency traces, we know that we cannot obtain the full Relativized Alon Conjecture. Perhaps by a combination of Puder's methods and ours—and perhaps some new ideas—one can find a modified adjacency trace for which one can prove $1/n$-asymptotic expansions to arbitrary order with coefficients that are polyexponential with an error term of type $O(2\sqrt{d-1} + \epsilon)^k$, and thereby establish the Relativized Alon Conjecture an arbitrary base graph, B.

Glossary

Numbers in italic indicate primary definitions. Greek letters are alphabetized by their English spelling.

abstract partial trace a general setup to which we can apply side-stepping methods, which includes applications to $1/n$-asymptotic expansions arising in the certified trace. *91*

$1/n$-asymptotic expansion an asymptotic expansion of a function $f(k, n)$ in powers of $1/n$ with coefficients being functions of k. 16, *29*, 32, 37, 38, 41, 51, 105

- **B-Ramanujan** a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion whose coefficients are B-Ramanujan functions. *29*
- **coefficient** a function of k that appears as the coefficient of a $1/n$ power in a $1/n$-asymptotic expansion. *29*, 37, 38, 41, 105

(B, ϵ)-tangle a connected graph, $\psi \in \mathrm{Occurs}_B$, for which $\rho(H_\psi) \geq \epsilon + \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$. *23*, 63

B-graph a graph morphism to B, or, abusively, a graph with a given morphism to the graph B. *65*

- **morphism of B-graphs** a morphism of the sources that respects the B structure of the B-graphs. 65

B-Ramanujan function a function with a polyexponential part in the eigenvalues $\mu_i(B)$ and an error term. *28*, 32, 37, 38, 40, 123

- **error term** the error term of a B-Ramanujan function. *28*
- **principle part** the part of a B-Ramanujan function that is a polyexponential in the eigenvalues $\mu_i(B)$. *28*

B-tangle a connected graph, $\psi \in \mathrm{Occurs}_B$, for which $\rho(H_\psi) \geq \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$. ix, *23*, 31, 33, 37, 63

beaded path a walk in a graph, each of whose interior vertices have degree two; especially used in the type (graph) of a walk, where one deletes all or all but one vertices of degree two, which breaks the deleted vertices into interior vertices of beaded paths. *12*, 39

bouquet of d half-loops the graph, H_d, which has one vertex and d half-loops. 8

bouquet of $d/2$ whole-loops the graph, $W_{d/2}$, which has one vertex and $d/2$ whole-loops (with d even). 8, 24

Broder-Shamir model our standard model, $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, of a covering map of degree n to a graph, B . 3, *18*

certified trace the number of strictly non-backtracking closed walks, w, in a graph such that Graph(w) is of less than a given order and has its Hashimoto matrix spectral radius at most $\rho^{1/2}(H_B)$ or, in Section 3.3, at most $\epsilon + \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$ for a fixed value of $\epsilon > 0$. *31*, 40

coefficient norm the norm that takes a (real or complex) polynomial and returns the absolute value of its largest coefficient. *45*

coincidence a value, i, for which the head of the i-th edge in a random walk was already visited in the walk, but the value of this i-th edge was not determined. *27*, 57

convolution convolution in the additive sense, e.g., the sum of $g_1(k_1)g_2(k_2)$ with $k_1 + k_2$ fixed. *43*

  weighted convolution weighted convolution in the additive sense, e.g., the sum of $g_1(k_1)g_2(k_2)$ with $m_1k_1 + m_2k_2$ fixed for fixed m_1, m_2 called the *weights*. *47*

covering map a morphism of graphs or directed graphs that is an isomorphism on heads neighbourhoods and tails neighbourhoods of each vertex in the domain with that of its image. 3, *14*

directed graph a tuple $G = (V_G, E_G^{\text{dir}}, h_G, t_G)$ of a set of vertices, directed edges, and heads and tails maps. *11*

  morphism of directed graphs a set theoretic map of vertices and edges from one graph to another that preserves the heads and tails relations. *12*

directed line graph the graph, Line(G), of a graph G whose vertices are the directed edges of G, with an edge from e_1 to e_2 iff $h_G(e_1) = t_G(e_2)$ and $\iota_G(e_2) \neq \iota_G(e_1)$. *13*

edge an orbit of the graph involution in a graph, i.e., a set of the form $\{e, \iota e\}$, where e is a directed edge of the underlying directed graph and where ι is the opposite map parent. *11*

$\eta_{\text{fund}}(B)$ the order of the smallest strict tangle in B. 4, *68*

étale map a morphism of graphs or directed graphs that is an injection on heads neighbourhoods and tails neighbourhoods of each vertex in the domain with that of its image. *14*

form the data of all the information about a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$ that a potential walk determines; formally, it is a tuple $(F, \mathcal{E})$, where F is a variable-length graph, and $\mathcal{E}$ assigns to each edge of F a walk in B; each potential walk has a unique form associated to it, and a forms are organized by their type. *59*

fundamental order of B the order of the smallest strict tangle in B. *68*, 117

graph a tuple $G = (V_G, E_G^{\text{dir}}, h_G, t_G, \iota_G)$ where $(V_G, E_G^{\text{dir}}, h_G, t_G)$ is a directed graph (the *underlying directed graph*), and ι_G is a heads/tails reversing involution (sometimes called the *opposite map*). 3, *11*

directed edge the edge set of a directed graph, or, for a graph, that of its underlying directed graph. *11*

involution *11*

morphism of graphs a morphism of underlying directed graphs that preserves the opposite map. *12*

opposite map a heads/tail reversing involution that gives a directed graph the structure of a graph. *11*

orientation the choice of one representative directed edge for an edge of a graph. *11, 12*

oriented graph a graph with an orientation for each of its edges. *12*

undirected edge 11

graph of a walk the subgraph, $\text{Graph}(w)$, traced out by a walk, w, in a graph. *25*

growth describes a function of k bounded by $Ck^C\rho^k$ for some given C and (more importantly) ρ. *45*

half-loop an edge in a graph which is paired (via the graph involution) with itself. 3, *11*

Hashimoto matrix the adjacency matrix, H_G, of the directed line graph of G. 9, *13*

loop a strictly non-backtracking closed walk each of whose vertices have degree two. *25*

new function a function on the vertices of a covering graph such that on all vertex fibres their sum is zero. *16*

new spectrum the part of the spectrum arising from new functions of a covering map. *16*

Occurs_B a graph which is a subgraph of some element of $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. *23*

old function a function on the vertices of a covering graph such that on all vertex fibres they are constant. *16*

old spectrum the part of the spectrum arising from old functions of a covering map. *16*

Ω-form the analogue of a form for an Ω-type; i.e., all the data in the graph determined by a potential walk plus a graph inclusion. *86*

Ω-type a structure that combines a potential graph specialization of a graph, Ω, into a $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$, along with a potential walk, where we keep all of Ω in the Ω-type

but, as usual, discard those vertices of the potential walk of degree two that are interior vertices of the walk (not in Ω). *86*

order $\mathrm{ord}(G) = -\chi(G)$, minus the Euler characteristic of G, i.e., $|E_G| - |V_G|$. *23*, 31, 33, 37, 38, 41

oriented line graph *13*

permutation assignment a map $E_B^{\mathrm{dir}} \to \mathcal{S}_n$, used in defining the Broder-Shamir model, $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$, of a random covering of degree n of a graph, B. *14*

polyexponential a real or complex valued function on $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^m$ given by a sum of a product of polynomials in the variables times exponential functions in the variables. *39*, 43

potential graph specialization an event in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ which would give rise to the inclusion of a B-graph to a graph $G \in \mathcal{C}_n(B)$. *79*

potential walk a pair $(w; \vec{t})$, consisting of a walk, w, of length k in the base graph, B, and a trajectory of values, t, which assigns to every vertex of w an integer from 1 to n (for the model $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$; intuitively a potential walk is a random event that give rise to a walk in the random graphs in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$. *52*

pruned a graph each of whose vertices has degree at least two. *41*

Ramanujan graph a d-regular graph, for some integer d, such that all its adjacency eigenvalues, aside from d and possibly $-d$, are at most $2(d-1)^{1/2}$. 3

self-loop a directed edge or edge in a graph or directed graph whose head and tail are the same. 3, *11*

shift operator in k the operator taking $f(n,k)$ and returning $f(n,k+1)$. *89*

subgraphs occurring in a B **covering** the subgraphs occurring in $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ for some n, where $\mathcal{C}_n(B)$ is the Broder-Shamir model or a related model. *23*

tangle of B a graph, $\psi \in \mathrm{Occurs}_B$ for which $\rho(H_\psi) \geq \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$. *23*

strict tangle of B a graph, ψ, in Occurs_B for which $\rho(H_\psi) > \rho^{1/2}(H_B)$. *23*, 63, 68, 117

tree a connected graph of Euler characteristic -1, i.e., a tree in the usual sense, which includes the case of a graph with one vertex and no edges. *41*

treeless a graph with no connected components that are trees. *41*

type the data associated to any closed walk in a graph which remembers the following information: the initial vertex, the vertices of length at least three, the (beaded) paths of the walk between such vertices (yielding a graph called the *type graph* of the walk, which is an oriented graph by orienting the edges by the direction in which they are first traversed; the order in which each of these vertices and paths are first encountered; and the B-neighbourhood of each vertex (the *lettering*). Alternatively, it is this data (an oriented graph, orderings of vertices and edges, and B-neighbourhood) as abstract data (not associated to a particular walk). x, 31, *39*, *58*

undirected graph *11*

variable-length graph a graph or directed graph whose edges or directed edges each have an associated length. *17*

realization of a variable-length graph the graph, $\mathrm{VLG}(G, \vec{k})$, by taking a directed or undirected variable-length graph and replacing each edge, e, by a path of length $k(e)$. *17*

walk an alternating sequence of vertices and directed edges that "follow in sequence," in a graph or directed graph. *12*

closed a walk whose first vertex equals its last. *12*

interior vertex a vertex in a walk which is not the first or last vertex. *12*

non-backtracking a walk where any two consecutive edges are not opposites. *12*, 39

reverse walk the reverse walk of a walk, w, in a graph is the walk where the order of the vertices and edges are reversed, and each edge is replaced by its opposite. *12*, 59

strictly non-backtracking closed a closed, non-backtracking walk whose first and last edges are not opposites. *12*

walk sum a sum of expected values of walks, w, in graphs subject to certain restrictions on $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$, the length of w, and the manner in which w traces out $\mathrm{Graph}(w)$ in its sequence of vertices and edges. 39, 40

whole-loop an edge in a graph which is paired (via the graph involution) with a different edge. 3, *11*

Bibliography

[ABG10] Louigi Addario-Berry and Simon Griffiths, *The spectrum of random lifts*, available as `http://arxiv.org/abs/1012.4097`.

[AFH] Omer Angel, Joel Friedman, and Shlomo Hoory, *The non-backtracking spectrum of the universal cover of a graph*, Transactions of the AMS, to appear.

[AL02] Alon Amit and Nathan Linial, *Random graph coverings. I. General theory and graph connectivity*, Combinatorica **22** (2002), no. 1, 1–18. MR 1883559 (2003a:05131)

[AL06] ———, *Random lifts of graphs: edge expansion*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **15** (2006), no. 3, 317–332. MR 2216470 (2007a:05125)

[ALM02] Alon Amit, Nathan Linial, and Jiří Matoušek, *Random lifts of graphs: independence and chromatic number*, Random Structures Algorithms **20** (2002), no. 1, 1–22. MR 1871947 (2003a:05132)

[ALMR01] Alon Amit, Nathan Linial, Jiří Matoušek, and Eyal Rozenman, *Random lifts of graphs*, Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (Washington, DC, 2001) (Philadelphia, PA), SIAM, 2001, pp. 883–894. MR 1958564

[Alo86] N. Alon, *Eigenvalues and expanders*, Combinatorica **6** (1986), no. 2, 83–96, Theory of computing (Singer Island, Fla., 1984). MR 88e:05077

[AM84] Noga Alon and V. D. Milman, *Eigenvalues, expanders and superconcentrators (extended abstract)*, FOCS, IEEE Computer Society, 1984, pp. 320–322.

[AM85] N. Alon and V. D. Milman, λ_1, *isoperimetric inequalities for graphs, and superconcentrators*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B **38** (1985), no. 1, 73–88. MR 782626 (87b:05092)

[Bas92] Hyman Bass, *The Ihara-Selberg zeta function of a tree lattice*, Internat. J. Math. **3** (1992), no. 6, 717–797. MR 1194071 (94a:11072)

[BL06] Yonatan Bilu and Nathan Linial, *Lifts, discrepancy and nearly optimal spectral gap*, Combinatorica **26** (2006), no. 5, 495–519. MR 2279667 (2008a:05160)

[BS87] Andrei Broder and Eli Shamir, *On the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs*, Proceedings 28th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, 1987, pp. 286–294.

[FJR+98] Joel Friedman, Antoine Joux, Yuval Roichman, Jacques Stern, and Jean-Pierre Tillich, *The action of a few permutations on r-tuples is quickly transitive*, Random Struct. Algorithms **12** (1998), no. 4, 335–350, A conference version appeared in STACS 1996.

[FKS89] J. Friedman, J. Kahn, and E. Szemerédi, *On the second eigenvalue of random regular graphs*, 21st Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, 1989, pp. 587–598.

[FM] Alan M. Frieze and Michael Molloy, *Splitting an expander graph*, J. of Algorithms **33**, 166–172.

[Fri] Joel Friedman, *Sheaves on graphs, their homological invariants, and a proof of the hanna neumann conjecture: with an appendix by warren dicks*, Memoirs of the AMS, to appear.

[Fri91] Joel Friedman, *On the second eigenvalue and random walks in random d-regular graphs*, Combinatorica **11** (1991), no. 4, 331–362. MR 93i:05115

[Fri93a] ———, *Relative expansion and an extremal degree two cover of the boolean cube*, preprint, unpublished, available at `http://www.math.ubc.ca/~jf/pubs/web_stuff/cover.html`.

[Fri93b] ———, *Some geometric aspects of graphs and their eigenfunctions*, Duke Math. J. **69** (1993), no. 3, 487–525. MR 94b:05134

[Fri03] ———, *Relative expanders or weakly relatively Ramanujan graphs*, Duke Math. J. **118** (2003), no. 1, 19–35. MR MR1978881 (2004m:05165)

[Fri05] ———, *Cohomology of Grothendieck topologies and lower bounds in Boolean complexity*, preprint, 70 pages. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0512008` and `http://www.math.ubc.ca/jf`, specifically `http://www.math.ubc.ca/~jf/pubs/web_stuff/groth1.pdf` `http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0512008`.

[Fri06] ———, *Cohomology of Grothendieck topologies and lower bounds in Boolean complexity ii*, preprint, 8 pages. Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/cs/0604024` and `http://www.math.ubc.ca/jf`, specifically `http://www.math.ubc.ca/~jf/pubs/web_stuff/groth2.pdf`.

[Fri07] ———, *Linear transformations in Boolean complexity theory*, CiE '07: Proceedings of the 3rd conference on Computability in Europe (Berlin, Heidelberg), Springer-Verlag, 2007, pp. 307–315.

[Fri08] ———, *A proof of Alon's second eigenvalue conjecture and related problems*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **195** (2008), no. 910, viii+100. MR MR2437174

[Fri11a] Joel Friedman, *Sheaves on graphs and a proof of the Hanna Neumann conjecture*, preprint, 59 pages. Available at `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1105.0129v1` and `http://www.math.ubc.ca/jf`, specifically `http://www.math.ubc.ca/~jf/pubs/web_stuff/mehanna.pdf`.

[Fri11b] ———, *Sheaves on graphs and their homological invariants*, Available at `http://arxiv.org/pdf/1104.2665v1` and `http://www.math.ubc.ca/jf`, specifically `http://www.math.ubc.ca/~jf/pubs/web_stuff/short_lim.pdf`.

[GG81] Ofer Gabber and Zvi Galil, *Explicit constructions of linear-sized superconcentrators*, J. Comput. System Sci. **22** (1981), no. 3, 407–420, Special issued dedicated to Michael Machtey. MR 633542 (83d:94029)

[GJR10] Catherine Greenhill, Svante Janson, and Andrzej Ruciński, *On the number of perfect matchings in random lifts*, Combin. Probab. Comput. **19** (2010), no. 5-6, 791–817. MR 2726080 (2011h:05229)

[Has89] Ki-ichiro Hashimoto, *Zeta functions of finite graphs and representations of p-adic groups*, Automorphic forms and geometry of arithmetic varieties, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 15, Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1989, pp. 211–280. MR 1040609 (91i:11057)

[Has90] ———, *On zeta and L-functions of finite graphs*, Internat. J. Math. **1** (1990), no. 4, 381–396. MR MR1080105 (92e:11089)

[Has92] ———, *Artin type L-functions and the density theorem for prime cycles on finite graphs*, Internat. J. Math. **3** (1992), no. 6, 809–826. MR MR1194073 (94c:11083)

[HLW06] Shlomo Hoory, Nathan Linial, and Avi Wigderson, *Expander graphs and their applicationns*, Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society **43** (2006), no. 4, 439–561.

[Iha66] Yasutaka Ihara, *On discrete subgroups of the two by two projective linear group over* p*-adic fields*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **18** (1966), 219–235. MR MR0223463 (36 #6511)

[Kas07] Martin Kassabov, *Symmetric groups and expander graphs*, Invent. Math. **170** (2007), no. 2, 327–354. MR 2342639 (2008g:20009)

[KS00] Motoko Kotani and Toshikazu Sunada, *Zeta functions of finite graphs*, J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **7** (2000), no. 1, 7–25. MR MR1749978 (2001f:68110)

[KS11] Mike Krebs and Anthony Shaheen, *Expander families and Cayley graphs. A beginner's guide.*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. xxiv, 258 p., 2011 (English).

[LP10] Nati Linial and Doron Puder, *Word maps and spectra of random graph lifts*, Random Structures Algorithms **37** (2010), no. 1, 100–135. MR 2674623

[LR05] Nathan Linial and Eyal Rozenman, *Random lifts of graphs: perfect matchings*, Combinatorica **25** (2005), no. 4, 407–424. MR 2143247 (2006c:05110)

[LSV11] Eyal Lubetzky, Benny Sudakov, and Van Vu, *Spectra of lifted Ramanujan graphs*, Adv. Math. **227** (2011), no. 4, 1612–1645. MR 2799807 (2012f:05181)

[MSS13] Adam Marcus, Daniel Spielman, and Nikhil Srivastava, *Interlacing families I: Bipartite Ramanujan graphs of all degrees*, ArXiv e-prints **1304.4132** (2013).

[Nil91] A. Nilli, *On the second eigenvalue of a graph*, Discrete Math. **91** (1991), no. 2, 207–210. MR 92j:05124

[PP12] Doron Puder and Ori Parzanchevski, *Measure preserving words are primitive*, Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1202.3269`.

[Pud11] Doron Puder, *Primitive words, free factors and measure preservation*, Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1104.3991`.

[Pud12] ———, *Expansion of random graphs: New proofs, new results*, Available at `http://arxiv.org/abs/1212.5216`.

[ST96] H. M. Stark and A. A. Terras, *Zeta functions of finite graphs and coverings*, Adv. Math. **121** (1996), no. 1, 124–165. MR MR1399606 (98b:11094)

[ST00] ———, *Zeta functions of finite graphs and coverings. II*, Adv. Math. **154** (2000), no. 1, 132–195. MR MR1780097 (2002f:11123)

[Sta83] John R. Stallings, *Topology of finite graphs*, Invent. Math. **71** (1983), no. 3, 551–565. MR MR695906 (85m:05037a)

[Tan84] R. Michael Tanner, *Explicit concentrators from generalized N-gons*, SIAM J. Algebraic Discrete Methods **5** (1984), no. 3, 287–293. MR 752035 (85k:68080)

[Ter11] Audrey Terras, *Zeta functions of graphs*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 128, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2011, A stroll through the garden. MR 2768284 (2012d:05016)

[TS07] A. A. Terras and H. M. Stark, *Zeta functions of finite graphs and coverings. III*, Adv. Math. **208** (2007), no. 1, 467–489. MR MR2304325 (2009c:05103)

[TV12] Terence Tao and Van Vu, *Random matrices: The universality phenomenon for wigner ensembles*, ArXiv e-print (2012), Available at: `http://arxiv.org/abs/1202.0068`.

[Wig55] E. Wigner, *Characteristic vectors of bordered matrices with infinite dimensions*, Annals of Math. **63** (1955), no. 3, 548–564.